



DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY  
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL  
MONTEREY CA 93943-5101











# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a Report Security Classification: <b>Unclassified</b>		1b Restrictive Markings	
2a Security Classification Authority		3 Distribution/Availability of Report	
5 Declassification/Downgrading Schedule		Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.	
Performing Organization Report Number(s)		5 Monitoring Organization Report Number(s)	
6a Name of Performing Organization Naval Postgraduate School	6b Office Symbol (if applicable) 036	7a Name of Monitoring Organization Naval Postgraduate School	
6c Address (city, state, and ZIP code) Monterey CA 93943-5000		7b Address (city, state, and ZIP code) Monterey CA 93943-5000	
8a Name of Funding/Sponsoring Organization	6b Office Symbol (if applicable)	9 Procurement Instrument Identification Number	
6c Address (city, state, and ZIP code)		10 Source of Funding Numbers	
		Program Element No	Project No Task No Work Unit Accession No

11 Title (include security classification) **GENDER BIAS IN THE NAVY**

12 Personal Author(s) **Ernst, Robert W. and Gilbeau, Robert J.**

13a Type of Report Master's Thesis	13b Time Covered From To	14 Date of Report (year, month, day) June 1993	15 Page Count 129
---------------------------------------	-----------------------------	---	----------------------

16 Supplementary Notation The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.

17 COSATI Codes			18 Subject Terms (continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) Gender Bias, Sexual Harassment Navy
Field	Group	Subgroup	

19 Abstract (continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)  
Abstract

An investigation of sexual harassment, gender bias, and women in combat was conducted via personal interviews with male Navy and Marine Corps officers. This study, unlike most, addresses these issues from the male perspective. This thesis includes a review of important historical events leading to the integration of women into the military. An explanation of the interview protocol will help show how major themes were obtained in the analysis of data. Problem areas in the navy environment will be addressed in conclusion section. Also, this section will give the most common occurring themes and practical recommendations for integrating women into combatant roles in the Navy.

20 Distribution/Availability of Abstract <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> unclassified/unlimited <input type="checkbox"/> same as report <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC users		21 Abstract Security Classification Unclassified	
22a Name of Responsible Individual Frank J. Barrett		22b Telephone (include Area Code) (408) 656-2573	22c Office Symbol AS/BR

FORM 1473, 84 MAR

83 APR edition may be used until exhausted  
All other editions are obsolete

security classification of this page  
Unclassified

T259791

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

GENDER BIAS IN THE NAVY

by

Robert W. Ernst

Lieutenant, United States Navy

B.S., United States Naval Academy, 1984

and

Robert J. Gilbeau

Lieutenant, United States Navy

B.S., United States Naval Academy, 1983

Submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

JUNE 1993



## **ABSTRACT**

An investigation of sexual harassment, gender bias, and women in combat was conducted via personal interviews with male Navy and Marine Corps officers. This study, unlike most, addresses these issues from the male perspective.

This thesis includes a review of important historical events leading to the integration of women into the military. An explanation of the interview protocol will help show how major themes were obtained in the analysis of data. Problem areas in the Navy environment will be addressed in conclusion section. Also, this section will give the most common occurring themes and practical recommendations for integrating women into combatant roles in the Navy.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II.	DATA COLLECTION METHODS . . . . .	5
	A. OVERVIEW . . . . .	5
	B. INTERVIEWS . . . . .	5
	C. DATA ANALYSIS AND THEME DEVELOPMENT . . . . .	6
III.	LITERATURE REVIEW . . . . .	7
	A. WOMEN IN THE MILITARY: PRE-WORLD WAR I . . . . .	7
	B. WOMEN IN THE MILITARY: WORLD WAR I . . . . .	9
	C. WOMEN IN THE MILITARY: WORLD WAR II . . . . .	10
	D. WOMEN IN THE MILITARY: POST WORLD WAR II . . . . .	14
	1. The Military, Women, and the End of the War . . . . .	14
	2. Permanent Integration for Women . . . . .	15
	3. Women's Armed Services Integration Act . . . . .	18
	4. Service Women of the 1950's . . . . .	20
	a. Korea and Greater Numbers of Women in Uniform . . . . .	20
	b. DACOWITS . . . . .	21
	5. Service women of the 1960's . . . . .	22
	a. Pregnancy Discharges Costly . . . . .	22
	b. Public Law 90-130 . . . . .	22

c.	Vietnam . . . . .	23
d.	Litigation Against Pregnancy Discharges	23
E.	1970's A DECADE OF CHANGE . . . . .	24
1.	Changes in Armed Service's Policy . . . . .	24
a.	Waiver for Pregnancy . . . . .	24
b.	"Z-Gram 116" . . . . .	25
c.	Other Administrative Changes . . . . .	26
2.	General Unrestricted Line Development . . . . .	27
3.	USS Sanctuary . . . . .	28
4.	Other "Breakthroughs" of the 70's . . . . .	29
5.	Owens v. Brown and Public Law 95-48 . . . . .	30
F.	UTILIZATION OF WOMEN INCREASES IN THE 1980'S . . . . .	31
1.	Integration of MLSF Considered . . . . .	31
2.	DOPMA . . . . .	32
3.	Draft for Women Not Approved . . . . .	33
4.	Other Significant Events of 1980 and 1981 . . . . .	33
5.	Official Recognition of General Unrestricted Line . . . . .	34
6.	1982: Utilization of Women Increases, But No MLSF . . . . .	35
7.	1984: Still No MLSF, But More/Better Shore Billets . . . . .	36
8.	1985-1987: XO Billets and MPS Squadrons Open	37
9.	1987: Study on Progress of Women in the Navy	38
10.	1988: Billets Open to Women Finally Expand . . . . .	38
11.	1989: More Progress for Women . . . . .	39

G.	1990's: THE PROMISE OF A GENDER NEUTRAL NAVY . . . . .	39
	1. A Smooth Start to the Decade . . . . .	39
	2. TAILHOOK . . . . .	40
	3. 1993: Equality for Women on the Horizon . . . . .	40
	4. Current Demographics . . . . .	41
	5. Gender Neutral Navy Promised . . . . .	42
IV.	ANALYSIS . . . . .	43
A.	OVERVIEW . . . . .	43
B.	THEME I: A HIERARCHY OF JOBS IN THE NAVY . . . . .	43
	1. Theme . . . . .	43
	2. Justification . . . . .	43
C.	THEME II: FULL INTEGRATION WITH ONE STANDARD . . . . .	49
	1. Theme . . . . .	49
	2. Justification . . . . .	49
D.	THEME III: WOMEN CAUSE PROBLEMS . . . . .	59
	1. Theme . . . . .	59
	2. Justification . . . . .	59
E.	THEME IV: OPPOSITES DO NOT ALWAYS ATTRACT . . . . .	71
	1. Theme . . . . .	71
	2. Justification . . . . .	71
F.	THEME V: WOMEN DO NOT WANT TO DEPLOY . . . . .	78
	1. Theme . . . . .	78
	2. Justification . . . . .	78
G.	THEME VI: REVERENCE OF THE FEMALE BODY . . . . .	81
	1. Theme . . . . .	81

2. Justification . . . . .	81
H. THEME VII: MEN HAVE FEW INTERACTIONS WITH WOMEN . . . . .	84
1. Theme . . . . .	84
2. Justification . . . . .	84
I. THEME VIII: GENERATING RESPECT . . . . .	92
1. Theme . . . . .	92
2. Justification . . . . .	92
J. THEME IX: PEAK EXPERIENCES FOR MEN . . . . .	95
1. Theme . . . . .	95
2. Justification . . . . .	95
K. THEME X: DOUBLE STANDARDS ARE BAD . . . . .	98
1. Theme . . . . .	98
2. Justification . . . . .	98
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	105
A. CONCLUSION . . . . .	105
B. RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	105
1. Full Integration . . . . .	105
2. Maintain One Standard for Each Job Type . . . . .	106
3. Equality for Selective Service and Combat Options . . . . .	107
4. Change General Unrestricted Line Community . . . . .	107
5. Increase Gender Interaction Training . . . . .	109
APPENDIX A: . . . . .	111



APPENDIX B: . . . . .	114
LIST OF REFERENCES . . . . .	115
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST . . . . .	118

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE I:	NPS NAVY AND MARINE STUDENTS BY CURRICULA	. 90
----------	---	------



## I. INTRODUCTION

Sexual harassment is a topic that has become a major issue of the 1990's. It was brought into the national spotlight during the Supreme Court confirmation hearings of Judge Clarence Thomas when Anita Hill, a law professor and former colleague of Thomas, levied accusations of sexual harassment against the respected judge. The Navy had its own major incident at the 1991 Tailhook convention. There, some 26 women were physically attacked by Navy and Marine Corps officers. Thus, the issue of sexual harassment in the military work place was rapidly thrust into a position of prominence. This vitally important issue suddenly received the attention it deserved. The increased concern is warranted, especially at a time when there are increasing numbers of women in the military and plans of integrating women into traditionally all male combat roles is now politically feasible.

For women in American society, job equality and acceptance in a male dominated environment is difficult for many reasons. Rosabeth Moss Kanter addressed this in her book Men and Women of the Corporation. Managers feel most comfortable having subordinates working for them that have similar attitudes and beliefs. The military's reliance on conformity in uniforms, behavior, and tradition is an example of this. Also, the

chance to succeed in an organization is related to the opportunity presented to an individual. Since women are currently restricted from combat, their exposure is limited to non-warfare specific jobs. When warfare is determined to be the appropriate policy to be used in the protection and defense of the country, women are forced to assist in support roles only. In the military, exclusion from direct combat arms puts a group at a disadvantage when compared to those who are required to actually fight. The disadvantages range from personal feelings of regret to less professional experience and training. The ultimate outcome is that warfare qualification standards, evaluations and promotion opportunities are not perceived as being equal to all by the members of the armed forces.

This type of separation is referred to as a division of labor in an article entitled Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations by Joan Acker. Her theory is based upon the fact that the "most powerful organizational positions are almost entirely occupied by men, with the exception of the occasional biological female who acts as a social man" (Sorenson, 1984, cited in Acker, 1990). Thus the majority of policy and organizational structure is designed by, and subsequently for, men. When physical separations or divisions from power are formed by these established policies or structures, the women will be the ones who are the most disadvantaged. The traditional institutional hierarchy will



still have men in highest positions because within the hierarchy they are more prevalent in the power type jobs. The different divisions created through the existing hierarchies have their own unique languages, social structures, and interactions that further enhance this separation of gender. From business suits, or military uniforms, to "men only" country clubs and warfare communities, these unique aspects of certain positions within the hierarchy of an organization promote the separation of men and women.

Thus women are isolated into non-combatant career paths some of which are not well defined or understood. Women strive for competence in their job and look for acceptance within this peer group. Men, however, typically assigned to sea duty combat jobs, rarely come into contact with women at sea. When they do, their perceptions, based on stereotypes, are easily reinforced and rarely reversed. Males feel their female counterparts take the easier shore duty and less arduous sea duty assignments. They also feel that the warfare qualifications earned by females are less deserved due to the lack of state of the art weapon systems and limited employment scenarios that are normally associated with the commands open to women. Due to these, and other factors, resentment and poor acceptance of women in the Navy is enhanced by their absence from many sea duty jobs. This leads to a paradoxical situation, as women are presently restricted from these duties. Unless women can compete for jobs which are

associated with increased skill, level of knowledge or power, this problem will continue to exist and expand.

This thesis will look at sexual harassment, attitudes of gender bias, and integrating women into naval combatant roles. Most of the recent attention on this subject has been devoted to what it is like for women in the Navy and Marine Corps and how they have been victimized, harassed, and discriminated against. However, this thesis will address the subject from a male point of view. Especially what it is like to be part of the Navy when the culture is so radically changing. In particular, we will find out it is like for men to have women integrated into today's armed forces. This is a point of view that gets little attention in today's society. Few people appreciate what life is like for men in the Navy and Marine Corps, so this study will focus on the perceptions and concerns voiced by these men. The goal of this study is to enhance the awareness of decision makers about the barriers to implementation of any plan which is designed to further the equality of women in the military.

## **II. DATA COLLECTION METHODS**

### **A. OVERVIEW**

This thesis is part of an extensive, ongoing study being conducted at the Naval Postgraduate School on sexual harassment and gender bias in the Navy. This thesis team, composed of one Naval Aviator and one Supply Officer, embarked on an intensive course of study to become familiar with the many aspects of sexual harassment, gendering of organizations, women in the military and traditional roles of men in the military. The causes and effects of gender bias and sexual harassment in society and the history of women in the military were studied through a comprehensive literature review. Sources included: video taped briefings, surveys, government generated reports, civilian academic papers, books, articles and published data on applicable topics from various surveys, commissions and study groups.

### **B. INTERVIEWS**

The interview protocol, included as Appendix A, was derived from data obtained through questionnaires returned during the Naval Postgraduate School Sexual Harassment stand down. One hundred in-depth interviews were conducted with male officers in the United States Navy and Marine Corps, most

of whom were attending the Naval Postgraduate School. A deliberate attempt was made to include officers representing as many communities as possible. Each interview lasted approximately 1.5 hours. Verbatim transcripts were created for use in the analysis.

### **C. DATA ANALYSIS AND THEME DEVELOPMENT**

The analysis of the data was conducted in a manner to identify common recurring themes from the perspective of male officers with respect to the current and future integration of women in the Department of the Navy uniformed services. Techniques described in Glaser and Strauss (1967) and Miles (1983) and Miles and Huberman (1984) were used for the data analysis. An iterative process of systematically going back and forth between theoretical insights and data resulted in the identification of ten common themes.

These themes were first postulated by the individual team members separately after thorough analysis of all interviews. These initial themes were compared and synthesized resulting in the ten common reoccurring themes.

### III. LITERATURE REVIEW

#### A. WOMEN IN THE MILITARY: PRE-WORLD WAR I

Through the years women have slowly progressed into more military roles and missions. Traditional roles for women and religious values of early Americans restricted women from working, let alone being in the military. Occasionally, women performed in the military in times of need. These isolated incidents eventually led significant breakthroughs for women and ultimately to today's reliance on women in the all volunteer force. Changes in societal attitudes should eventually lead to women being involved in combat roles.

One of the most famous events in colonial America involved a woman called "Molly Pitcher". Her actual identity is disputed, but her role and accomplishments were not. She carried water to the troops and helped care for the wounded during battle. In 1778 during the battle of Monmouth she operated a cannon by herself when the regular personnel were killed. She performed admirably, without training, until relieved by replacements. (Holm, 1982, p. 4)

Women often traveled with the troops and helped relieve various personnel shortages in support roles. They also provided services as nurses. Though not official members of the military, their contributions in these support roles were



significant. Being so close to battle, they would occasionally perform heroic combat jobs similar to Molly Pitcher.

The 1800's brought increased participation of women. The Civil War was the major conflict that saw women involved in the war effort on both sides. Women served as saboteurs, scouts, couriers, nurses, and spies. Several even participated as soldiers disguised as males. The women participated in all these assignments and were particularly effective as spies. (Quester in Goldman, 1982, p. 226) They added a new and now more commonly used approach to utilizing all human resources in warfare.

Females made their biggest in roads as nurses during the Civil War. They improved the medical care and were better trained and more qualified than male hospital corpsmen. However, there was resistance to including women, even as nurses, into the military. This was mainly due to the concern of having women in the field of combat with men and the additional items that would be required to support women in the field. This attitude was prevalent even among medical officers. It was maintained well after the Civil War and until the end of the century. Finally, the Surgeon General George Sternberg overcame his own resistance and started procedures for giving women limited military status. It led to Congressional establishment of the Nurse Corps in 1901. It was an auxiliary of the Army, thus they weren't entitled to

military rank, equal pay and benefits. In 1908, the Navy established their own Nurse Corps with similar limited status. (Holm, 1982, p. 9)

#### **B. WOMEN IN THE MILITARY: WORLD WAR I**

As it appeared that the United States would inevitably become involved in the war, Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels realized that there would be personnel shortages. Thus, he successfully proposed and authorized having women in the Naval Reserve in 1917. It basically allowed women into land based office type jobs that would free up men to take front line combat jobs. It proved to be a wise move and the Marine Corps realized this and followed suit in 1918. The War Department never allowed women into any enlisted ratings despite seeing the Navy's success and recommendations from Army unit commanders. The differences in the attitudes of each service's senior staff determined the degree of female involvement in the war effort. Despite serious shortages of administrative personnel and recommendations from Congress, Secretary of War Newton Baker rejected the idea of establishing a dedicated corps for women. (Holm, 1982, p. 10)

Females, once again, made breakthroughs in existing social barriers by participating and having a significant positive impact on the war effort in their roles as nurses. Nurses comprised approximately 21,000 of the total 34,000 women who served in World War I. Ironically, despite this occupation

being highly successful for women it was still an auxiliary unit for all the services. Several women nurses received various medals for their performance during the war. Twenty three women were awarded the highest noncombatant medal, the Distinguished Service Medal. Three Army nurses even received the Distinguished Service Cross, a combat medal just below the Medal of Honor. When the Surgeon General saw the success of female nurses, he also wanted to commission female doctors. He ran into the same road block because the Secretary of War thought women weren't physically qualified to meet that part of the moral, mental, and physical requirements of officers. (Holm, 1982, pp. 10-14) Ironically, medical officers, such as doctors, require very little physical strength to perform their jobs.

After the war, women in the Navy and Marine Corps were discharged. Post war contingency plans to mobilize women for future emergencies never materialized. The military was once again back to the societal norm of being all male and without a major war on the horizon, there was no great effort or internal desire to change the status quo. (Quester in Goldman, 1982, p. 219)

### **C. WOMEN IN THE MILITARY: WORLD WAR II**

Once again, major war time personnel shortages would provide women an opportunity to enter the traditionally all male work force and the military. General George Marshall

realized that women would be needed in the military to free up the men for combat assignments. When it became evident that some legislators were working to force the Army to integrate women with full rights and benefits, he gave orders to his General Staff to come up with a workable plan. The plan called for a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps (WAAC) which allowed women to serve and gave them military status, but still didn't give them military rank or equitable pay. With this limited integration plan and opposition to women in the military among some members of Congress, it appeared evident that full military status for women in the Army would be difficult. Congresswoman Edith Rogers from Massachusetts realized this and decided to introduced the WAAC bill to get women at least some rights in military service. The WAAC bill became law on 15 May 1942. This limited status caused problems. Women were not given the same dependent's entitlements, legal protection overseas or medical benefits, if injured or wounded, as the men. It hurt the Army's recruiting as women saw the increased benefits their counterparts were getting in the Navy. This eventually led to the June 1943 establishment of the Women's Army Corps (WAC). This gave Army women full military status and eliminated most of the earlier inequities. (Holm, 1982, pp. 22-23)

The Navy proceeded about the same time to get legislation approved for women in the Naval Reserve and not an auxiliary unit like the Army. Military opposition to women in the

service was reduced by entry into the war. However, even though there were severe personnel shortages at the time, there was still some Congressional opposition to any bill allowing women into the armed forces. The dissent revolved around traditional ideals that the military was not a place for women. On 30 July 1942, after much delay, the Navy Women's Reserve (WAVES: Women Authorized for Volunteer Emergency Service) was established as Public Law 689. This law also authorized females in the Marine Corps. Women in the Coast Guard reserve would happen a few months later. (Holm, 1982, p. 27)

War casualties became very heavy by 1943 due to the increased magnitude of the battles overseas. That further exasperated the need for able bodied personnel. As more men were needed for combat, more jobs became open to females. The aviation units were the most progressive and enthusiastic as they employed large numbers of women at air stations. Over 23,000 WAVES were involved in naval aviation related jobs. The Marine Corps employed about one third of their women in aviation maintenance and support roles. The Army Air Force (AAF) had 40,000 women serving. The only female pilots were employed in Civil Service status as Women's Airforce Service Pilots (WASPs). Approximately 1000 of these women flew non-combat missions which included ferrying planes, target towing, and pilot training. They flew nearly every aircraft type in



the inventory and 28 of these women died in the line of duty before the unit was eliminated in 1944. (Holm, 1982, p. 64)

World War II also saw female nurses taken as prisoners of war (POW's). The nurses were staged right behind the troops in combat. They worked until the last possible minute caring for the wounded and saving lives before being evacuated from Manila and then Bataan. They finally served on Corregidor until captured by the Japanese. Sixty seven female nurses were POW's for 37 months. They were tortured and given minimal rations. They were thought to have survived as prisoners better than the men because, as nurses, they had to survive to help the others. (Rogan, 1981, pp. 258-271)

In spite of the major contribution of women in the military, they were ridiculed heavily. The press constantly published articles and cartoons degrading women in the military. The male service members negative attitude of the women affected recruiting and morale of women. General Marshall wrote to all his commanders to reinforce their leadership responsibility of a positive command atmosphere towards women in uniform (Treadwell, 1954, p. 275). However, the general public's overall opinion of women in the military was somewhat surprising. When it appeared that married men would possibly have to be drafted, seventy eight percent of the public favored drafting single women instead of married men for non-combat duty if the need ever arose (Holm, 1982, p. 57).

## D. WOMEN IN THE MILITARY: POST WORLD WAR II

### 1. The Military, Women, and the End of the War

At the height of World War II women were serving in many non-traditional roles such as metalsmiths, camera repair, printers and machinist's mates. Besides the few officers that were flying aircraft on ferrying missions, the bulk of the female officer corps were assigned to civil engineering, communications, intelligence, supply, legal, engineering, electronics, medical and dental jobs. The total naval force consisted of 3.4 million personnel. (Miller, 1977, p. 342) Women comprised 2.7% percent of these forces and numbered 8,000 officers and 78,000 enlisted (McKenzie, 1983, p. 11). The military billets at the Bureau of Naval Personnel, which did the Navy's personnel clerical work, were comprised of 70% women. At the Washington radio communication center, as much as 55% of the military members were female. This was another clerically intensive duty assignment, as it was the main communication center for the Navy (Thomas, 1978 and Holm, 1982, p. 100).

Demobilization after the war saw over ten million people leave the active armed forces. Finally, serious thought was given to address future personnel build ups for major conflicts. Areas of consideration included regular status for the women in the peacetime military. The women who had served in the support roles during the war had proven that

they were beneficial in the roles which they were allowed to serve. The Navy Nurse Corps remained intact and predominantly female. Because there was to be a large amount of paperwork, and thus clerical work, generated by this demobilization, the Navy requested many of the women in the clerical positions stay on as volunteers for active duty after June, 1946. Immediate promotion was offered to those who would stay, as an incentive (McKenzie, 1983, p. 12). When the male service members returned after the war, the traditionally male jobs were taken back by the regular forces as the reserves and emergency volunteers, like WAVES, were discharged. Thus, the Nurse Corps and clerical administrative jobs of the bureaucracies were left for women. (Holm, 1982, pp. 101-107)

## **2. Permanent Integration for Women**

The Secretary of Defense and his top generals and admirals, strongly supported retaining women in these support roles. It was viewed as a way to have a trained group available for future mobilizations, and ease the need for a peacetime draft. The Army Chief of Staff, General Dwight D. Eisenhower, was faced with a major shortage of trained personnel in 1947. He decided to keep WACs to fill the support billets, per the request of Army Personnel Chief, Major General W. S. Paul. The WAC, WAVE and Woman Marine Directors, as well as some members of Congress, maintained the opinion that women should only serve during the war. They

felt, at the war's end, these organizations should be disbanded as fast as possible. To reinforce this point, the senior women set the stage by leaving the service themselves. Colonel Streeter, Director of USMC Women Reserve, Captain McAfee of the Navy and Captain Stratton of the Coast Guard, all resigned and re-entered civilian life. Colonel Westrey Battle Boyce, director of WACs, supported demobilization of the women and stayed on to voice her opposition to Paul's plan. Due to the demobilization, shortage of skilled personnel and large numbers of disabled veterans, the military felt it needed to use the WAVES. One proponent of permanent integration, Colonel Joy Bright Hancock, succeeded McAfee as WAVE Director. She felt:

...women should become an integral part of the Navy because they were needed not only to carry out publicly demanded rapid demobilization but also to continue some of the peace time programs....for example...to "man" ground controlled approach equipment (GCA) in its early experimental stage and Hospital Corps' rehabilitation program. (Holm, 1982, p. 107)

This embodied the feelings of most of the more junior women in service and especially those who remained after the war. (Holm, 1982, pp. 106-109)

However, there was significant opposition to this movement. Concern that women would present more medical problems, the possibility of them leading men, and a strong opposition of women in combat were the major issues debated in Congress. The medical issue included things such as concerns

of menopause eventually causing disability. The Surgeon General finally showed that there was very little difference between male and female officers retiring from physical disability. Congressmen were hearing concerns from their constituents about men having to take orders from female officers. The issue of placing women in combat and getting killed was not likely to happen during this era either. (Holm, 1982, pp. 114-118)

The WAC Integration Act was approved by the Senate, but the bill went no further. Congresswoman Margaret Chase Smith in the Congressional Record of 06 April 1949, blamed the bill's demise on Navy Department officers' off-the-record statements to the House Armed Services Committee members. (Holm, 1982, p. 105) Eisenhower decided to try and maintain the WACs, over the objections of Boyce, and others, who felt the active peacetime military did not need women. Even though the WAC Integration Act did not become law, the WACs were not totally disestablished due to Eisenhower's desire to keep women in the force. The Army and Navy did manage to get the Nurse Act, Public Law 36-80C, passed in 1947. The Nurse Corps, primarily made up of women, became a permanent staff corps for these services. Women were thus kept on active duty, but they were entrenched in the Nurse Corps or clerical fields.



### 3. Women's Armed Services Integration Act

The Women's Armed Services Integration Act was passed in June 1948. This legislation gave women permanent status in Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. It also provided the military a means to mobilize women faster in time of war. This legislation, Public Law 625, seemed initially to please practically everyone, but it had problems that actually caused institutional segregation and inequalities for women in the military. Restrictions included:

- Limited enlisted women to 2% of total force.
- Authorized limited percentages of female commissioned officers and warrant officers (only one female O-6 per service).
- Career opportunities for women were limited because, with the exception of the one per service, they couldn't obtain rank above Lieutenant Colonel or Commander in the Navy (these were limited to a total of 10% of women officers).
- Women had to prove that their husband and children were dependent upon her for "their chief support" to receive dependent compensation.
- Many ratings which had been open to females during the war were now closed to them.
- Minimum enlistment age 18 years old, parental consent required if under 21. Male limits were 17 and 18 respectively.
- Authorized service Secretaries to discharge females from the service involuntarily. This facilitated dismissals for pregnancies and the services ensured their instructions detailed this policy.

This act was suppose to help women and eliminate the need for a peacetime draft. It did give women a permanent role, but it



was limited and the draft of males continued. (Holm, 1982, pp. 119-120) Section 6015 was most restrictive part of the law:

The Secretary may prescribe the kind of military duty to which such women members may be assigned and military authority which they may exercise. However, women may not be assigned to duty in aircraft that are engaged in combat missions nor may they be assigned to duty on vessels of the Navy other than hospital ships and transports.

The instructions to oust women if they became pregnant would stay part of Navy policy for years to come, as would the majority of the other restrictive portions of the law (Tamplin, 1974, p. 33). Because women were still not seen as truly integral parts of the military there were not even any records kept as to how many women were involuntarily separated due to pregnancies or other reasons, as authorized by the law, prior to 1972 (Thomas, 1993).

The era in which this bill was passed must be taken into consideration. Although it seems like gender biased legislation in the 1990's, it was in line with the new ideology of Americans of the late 1940's. As Holm says:

This law accurately reflected the prevailing cultural attitudes of the postwar period concerning women's roles and legal status. To have completely integrated them into the armed forces in 1948 with fully equal status would have been totally out of character with that stage in the evolution of women's roles in American society. (Holm, 1982, p.127)

#### 4. Service Women of the 1950's

##### *a. Korea and Greater Numbers of Women in Uniform*

As the decade of the 1950's came, so did an increase in women into the armed forces as a result of Public Law 625. The 2% limit on women in the services that it imposed, had yet to be reached though. By the time the Korean Conflict was emerging the total number of women in the Navy approached 22,000 or less than 1% of total Navy end strength. One third of these active duty women were members of the health care community. Duty aboard aircraft, ships and combat deployable forces was forbidden, per Public Law 625, so only the remaining assignments were open to women. Again, these were in the support roles. There were an abundance of females in these communities due to the policies enacted after WWII. Thus the women in the military were directed towards administrative type jobs. This continued the historical entrenchment of women in the Navy in the stereotypical secretarial role which started back with the Yeoman (Female) rating in 1908. (Tamplin, 1974, pp. 24-26)

Once again nurses had the biggest impact and they were placed close to combat in the Korean War with MASH (Mobile Army Surgical Hospital) units. Recruiting during the war was difficult because it was not a full scale mobilization like the other wars. Also, military pay was very low compared to the civilian market. The Department of Defense was now

distressed because the services' were not meeting their goals for the recruitment of women volunteers.

**b. DACOWITS**

Congress waived the 2% limit on women in the service to try and stimulate more voluntary enlistments of women. When this failed, Secretary of Defense George Marshall took a suggestion from Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Anna Rosenberg, to institute a committee to review women in the military. Thus, DACOWITS (Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services) was formed. This committee, made up of fifty prominent women was to assist with issues of women in the military and their utilization. Specifically, DACOWITS members were to:

- inform the public of recruiting needs
- reassure parents as to the administration and supervision of young women in the military
- convey to young women the career opportunities in the service
- raise the prestige of military women in the public mind (Holm, 1982, p.151)

The committee was determined to help the services get an increased number of women recruits. (Holm, 1982, pp. 150-157)

A national campaign was designed jointly with the Department of Defense to promote military service for women. It was even kicked off by President Truman, but to no avail. The campaign was a near disaster as it was poorly planned and badly timed. It was also doomed from the onset because of the

national mood towards the Korean war, the public's negative attitude about women serving in the military was not countered by patriotic propaganda and by the time the campaign was launched the pace of the war and the public interest had abated. DACOWITS did make some important observations and brought the plight of women equality and full integration into the Armed Forces to the public forum. (Holm, 1982, pp. 157-339)

## **5. Service women of the 1960's**

### ***a. Pregnancy Discharges Costly***

In 1963 a GAO study found that it was costing \$12 million a year to replace enlisted women who weren't completing their first enlistments. Spurred by this report, the military stopped letting women out of their contracts for pregnancy if stationed close to their husbands.

### ***b. Public Law 90-130***

President Lyndon B. Johnson, in 1967, removed restrictions on the careers of female officers with Public Law 90-130. It removed the 2% ceilings on women in the services and allowed women to obtain high ranks without ceilings as well. After he signed the bill on 8 November, President Johnson remarked: " There is no reason why we should not some day have a female Chief of Staff or even a Commander in Chief." (New York Times, 9 November, 1967, p. 3) This was the big hurdle that would lead to women obtaining the ranks of

general and admiral in the early 1970's (Holm, 1982, p.192). Three years later, on 11 June of 1970, two women were promoted to the rank of Brigadier General (BG). BG Elizabeth P. Hoisington, Director of Women's Army Corps, and BG Anna Mae Hays, Chief of the Army Nurse Corps.

### *c. Vietnam*

This decade also put women in a war setting again with Vietnam. Once again these female volunteers performed admirably as in past wars. They were also coming under direct fire more often in the combat environment.

By the time the U.S. forces were withdrawn, some 7,500 military women had served in Southwest Asia. Many of them returned with combat decorations, some with wounds inflicted by the enemy, others with psychological wounds inflicted by dealing firsthand with the horrors wrought by modern warfare....The women who were assigned to jobs in Southeast Asia during the war proved that, contrary to popular mythology and the image so carefully cultivated for them during the post-World War II period, the modern American woman is fully capable of functioning effectively in a military role in a combat environment, even under direct hostile fire. (Holm, 1982, pp. 206-207)

The difficulty of separating non-combat jobs was becoming more evident and remains, to this day, an argument for allowing expanded career opportunities for women.

### *d. Litigation Against Pregnancy Discharges*

The military was brought to court on the issue of discharge due to pregnancy at the very end of the decade. Captain Susan R. Struck and Airman First Class Gloria D. Robinson filed suit against the Air Force to stop discharge



proceedings against them which had commenced because they were un-wed mothers (New York Times, 3 January, 1971, p. 24 and Holm, 1982, p. 301). Another suit was filed against the Navy by a pregnant 23 year old Seaman who was also un-wed, Anna Flores. Although she miscarried the fetus, her Commanding Officer still pursued discharge on the grounds that:

...to do otherwise would imply that unwed pregnancy is condoned and would eventually result in a dilution of moral standards set for women in the Navy." (Washington Post, 25 August, 1970)

As these suits went through the lengthy legal processes, both the Navy and the Air Force decided the bad publicity made winning their case not worth while. All these women were allowed to return to active duty and their careers continued. (Holm, 1982, pp. 298-302)

## **E. 1970's A DECADE OF CHANGE**

### **1. Changes in Armed Service's Policy**

#### ***a. Waiver for Pregnancy***

By March of 1971 the Air Force had changed its regulations to allow pregnant service members to request a waiver if their Commanding Officers would state that "he" was able to do without them. The prevailing attitude toward pregnant military members is shown in this quote from the Air Force Officer and Enlisted Personnel Regulations:



...retention of members who become pregnant is not in the best interest of either the member or the Air Force. (Air Force Times, 17 March 1971, p. 17)

The Navy followed suit and held similar language in its regulations. (Tamplin, 1974, p. 35)

**b. "Z-Gram 116"**

The Chief of Naval Operations during this era, Admiral Elmo Zumwalt, used policy letters, referred to as "Z-Grams," to distribute his policy reforms throughout the fleet. Admiral Zumwalt was known for his strong support for equal opportunity with regard to both race and gender. The period of great social change which occurred during his tenure is referred to as "the Zumwalt era" by most naval personnel today. His leadership and dedication to these radical changes, for his time, were directly responsible for improved opportunities for women in the Navy. In August of 1972, he issued "Z-Gram 116," included as Appendix B. This policy letter, entitled "Equal Rights and Opportunities for Women in the Navy," detailed the following:

- All of the Navy's ratings were opened for limited entry of women. This meant that women could not be categorically barred from any rate, but upon further study admittance of women into the specialty could be achieved. As a result, open ratings would rise from 24, prior to the "Z-Gram," to 70.
- Staff Corps and Restricted Line were open to women.
- Women, who were determined to be qualified, could be assigned to billets such as; briefers, aides, action officers for CNO's staff and executive assistants.

- Service colleges were opened to women.
- More operational commands were made available to women.  
(McKenzie, 1983, pp. 13-15)

This policy change resulted in more overseas billets being opened to women to include isolated stations like Diego Garcia, Keflavik, Bahrain, Antarctica and Adak. (U.S. Navy Study, 1987, p. 12) The increased numbers of isolated duty stations was desired by the Department of the Navy. Those stations were classified as "equivalent to sea duty" for women and looked at as a substitute for a shipboard tour. Although it was now "legal", women would not be permanently assigned to Diego Garcia for another decade due to limited berthing and severe isolation.

### *c. Other Administrative Changes*

By the middle of 1973 the draft had been terminated. This caused concern for national security advisors as to whether the services would have difficulty meeting their end strength requirements. Women were, again, looked at to act as an alternative labor source to round out the force. Efforts to better integrate women were also aggressively pursued that year. The position of Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel for Women (Pers K) was disestablished because terminology was examined and some standard terms were considered degrading. For example, the use of acronym "WAVES" was officially discouraged when Capt Robin Quigley published

her "Memorandum...#5." In this memorandum, she let it be known that the acronym, which had been used unofficially for years, was in fact "not official." She wrote that the term WAVES implied that women were still a part of an auxiliary service, which they were not. She let it be known that women were part of the Navy and from that day forward, 23 February 1972, women would refer to themselves as the men in the Navy referred to themselves. No more WAVES, just officers, petty officers, etc. (Holm, 1982, pp. 278-281)

## **2. General Unrestricted Line Development**

In 1972, the General Unrestricted Line (initially given the acronym GURL, then changed to Gen URL) community began to take shape unofficially. Unrestricted line officers can be assigned to almost any job and are eligible for command at sea. Restricted line officers (including: medical, dental and supply) are assigned to jobs in their own specialty and are not eligible for command at sea. Those unrestricted line officers with warfare qualifications were reassigned separate designators from those with out qualifications. Officers designated 110X, did not have specialized training or warfare qualifications like other unrestricted line communities, for example: surface (111X), submarine (112X), and aviation (131X). Thus, these non-specialized officers were used to fill billets which did not have requirements for warfare skills. These were predominately administrative sections of

shore installations. About 650 women and a very few men (actual number not available) were designated by the 110X code after the redesignation took place (U.S. Navy Study, 1987, p. 30). The demographic structure of all women in the Navy saw some 3068 women officers and about 6000 enlisted personnel in uniform at this time. Of these, 2363 were in the Nurse Corps, 667 were in the various line communities and 38 were in other Staff Corps (Judge Advocate General, Supply, Chaplain and Civil Engineering Corps). (U.S. Navy study, 1987, pp. 7-9)

### **3. USS Sanctuary**

The USS Sanctuary, a hospital ship, was taken out of mothballs in 1972, recommissioned in 1973 and used as a pilot project for the implementation of women at sea. It was anticipated that this floating hospital would deploy to provide medical care to dependents stationed over seas. Sanctuary had 53 enlisted and 20 officer women aboard (McKenzie, 1983, p.16). No women were assigned to the Engineering Department of Sanctuary, as it was still an area dominated by males. Most of the women were actually assigned to the hospital section of the ship, though a few were assigned to the Supply, Deck, Operations and Administrative Departments. The Commanding Officer of Sanctuary stated:

...women can perform every shipboard task with equal ease, expertise and dedication as men do. Significant in this regard was the success of women on general quarters repair parties, and on general emergency teams, performance on

which is considered a good gauge of general naval ability.  
(Holm, 1982, p. 329)

When it was realized that this ship's underway time would be very limited it was considered a bit of a disappointment for the women aboard. After Sanctuary was decommissioned in 1975, due to mechanical problems, it was seen as an important project for future study of women at sea. The success of Sanctuary, growing population of women in sea duty intensive billets (like Boatswain's Mate, Internal Communicationsman and the aviation support ratings) and the pressure applied by these women were forcing the Navy to look for solutions to place women at sea. The Navy asked for and received approval to let women begin to serve aboard service craft in an attempt to replace the loss of this pilot ship. The USS Sanctuary pilot program served to prove that women could serve effectively aboard ship.

#### **4. Other "Breakthroughs" of the 70's**

March of 1973 saw another first for women in the Navy. Captain Quigley was placed in command of a non-gender specific shore command. The Commanding Officer, Service Schools Command, San Diego, California was now a female.

In 1976 the first women began attending Aviation Officer Candidate School and during the 1977 to 1978 time period, the Navy presented a case before Congress to modify



Section 6015 of Public Law 625 to allow more equitable use of women aboard ship.

#### **5. Owens v. Brown and Public Law 95-48**

During 1978 Judge John Sirica ruled on a law suit, Owens v. Brown, concerning section 6015's unfairness to women. He stated:

(section 6015)... unconstitutionally denies plaintiffs and the class of Navy women whom they represent their right to equal protection of the laws as guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution. (Owens v. Brown, 1978)

In October, the changes that the Navy had requested were passed by Congress as Public Law 95-485. Women would now be able to serve at sea on submarine and destroyer tenders. Women were also authorized to enter the Surface Warfare and Operations communities. This new law did not designate women as "noncombatants," in other words as Secretary of the Navy W. Graham Claytor phrased it, women were no longer prohibited from being part of the "combat team" of the Navy. It also did not place any restrictions on them transiting combat and hostile fire zones (Sadler, 1983). The passage of the 1979 Defense Authorization Bill included amendment 10 to Section 6015 which legalized assignment of women to non-combat ships and temporarily to combat ships which are not expected to have a combat mission during the period of the assignment. (U.S. Navy Study, 1987) Due to this law, the Secretary of the Navy issued policy in 1979 stipulating that women were not to be



assigned to combat duty and he specifically detailed which ships would be designated for assignment of women (SECNAVINST 1300.12). That year the Naval Flight Officer (NFO) program was opened to women and ceilings were placed on how many could enter aviation programs (20 to 30 pilots and 10 NFOs). The first woman Navy pilot obtained the qualifications necessary to land an airplane on an aircraft carrier. By the end of 1978, there were 56 female officers assigned to 14 ships (including tenders, repair and salvage ships) and 396 enlisted women assigned to 5 ships (tenders) throughout the Navy. (U.S. Navy Study, 1987)

## **F. UTILIZATION OF WOMEN INCREASES IN THE 1980'S**

### **1. Integration of MLSF Considered**

The opening of the decade of the 1980's saw relatively small opportunities for women Surface Warfare Officers (SWO) aboard Navy ships. This deficiency had prompted a Surface Warfare Panel Unrestricted Line Study to be conducted at the close of 1979 to review sea billet availability for women. It recommended that all Mobile Logistic Support Force (MLSF) ships be opened to women. The MLSF ships recommended to be integrated included five Oilers (AO), 7 Combat Stores (AFS), and 12 Ammunition (AE) class ships. The Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) at the time, Admiral Thomas B. Hayward, did not agree with those recommendations. He stated his support

for not assigning women to combat roles in a memorandum to the Secretary of the Navy when he stated:

...even if Section 6015 were repealed, I could not concur with any new or increased initiatives for our women to serve at sea over those now offered under existing law and implementing regulations. In fact, current rules were designed to bring us up to maximum levels of women in the Navy without crossing the combatant line as defined by Congress, a line with which I wholeheartedly agree. (Hayward, Letter to SECNAV)

Admiral Hayward's objections delayed the assignment of women to the MLSF force for several years.

## **2. DOPMA**

The Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (DOPMA) would also be passed in 1980. This was an attempt to equalize the treatment of male and female officers. It repealed all rules requiring different treatment for the appointment, promotion, accountability, separation and retirement for male and female officers as mandated by Public Law 6015. It did not, however, remove the combat exclusionary portions of 6015 (McKenzie, 1983, p.18), even though positive feedback, like that provided by the Captain of USS Sanctuary, was received from Commanding Officers of ships with women onboard. Reports of enthusiasm from the women themselves accompanied this good feedback from the Commanding Officers. (U.S. Navy Study, 1987)

### **3. Draft for Women Not Approved**

President Carter announced registration for the draft and wanted to include women in it. During House subcommittee hearings on the issue, Congress was presented such arguments as:

...it (draft of women) is contrary to American traditions, laws, morals, and the wishes of the majority of the American people. It is contrary to the Judeo-Christian culture which honors and respects women in their roles as wives and mothers. (Hearings on H. R. 6569, 1980)

and

...we don't want our daughters subjected to an army environment where there is little or no privacy, where the rape rate is considerably higher than in civilian life, ...where there is open toleration of immoral sex,...and where our daughters are subject to the sexual abuse which is a frequent reality. (Hearings on H. R. 6569, 1980)

These and similar arguments (cited in McKenzie, 1983) combined to dissuade Congress from allowing the draft of women. In June, Congress Authorizes funding of draft for males only.

### **4. Other Significant Events of 1980 and 1981**

In May of 1980, the first class with females graduated from Naval Academy. Policy issued by CNO dictated that females be removed from sea duty when it was determined that they were pregnant. (McKenzie, 1983, pp. 21-26)

One year later, June 1981, the Supreme Court ruled 6 to 3 that it is constitutional for Congress to exclude women from the draft. "The court reaffirmed the concept that

ordinary tests of equality do not apply when Congress is considering national defense" (Holm, 1982, p. 377). That same year, the jet pilot training pipeline was opened to women for the first time at a limit of 5 per year. Another step forward for women in the service occurred when the Naval Communications Station in Panama was staffed with a female CO and XO, a first for a mixed gender command.

#### **5. Official Recognition of General Unrestricted Line**

The General Unrestricted Line (Gen URL) Community became officially recognized and designated in 1981 as well. All "non-warfare" unrestricted line officers were now part of this community. There was no "pipeline" (initial qualification) training created for those selecting the Gen URL as they entered the Navy (historically more than 80% women). There was also no pipeline training for those males who would be assigned the designator after non-attainment of, or transfer from, other warfare designators. The 110X designator became the mechanism to utilize women in the shore establishment in a diverse variety of billet types located at most shore commands. These Unrestricted Line officers were to be assigned to shore billets with the billet code of 1000. This code identifies those billets which can be filled by any qualified Unrestricted Line Officer. The Gen URL officers thus have a career path that starts with no specialized training and keeps them predominantly in shore billets that

used to be filled by warfare qualified officers. (U.S. Navy Study, 1987)

#### **6. 1982: Utilization of Women Increases, But No MLSF**

In 1982, the first woman was selected for Test Pilot School, women were permanently assigned to Diego Garcia and pregnant women could be involuntarily retained by the Navy if they had needed skills or obligated service as a result of training they received. The number of women selected for pilot training increased to 20 officers.

The practice of not assigning women to MLSF (Mobile Logistic Support Force) ships was reviewed by the Department of the Navy in 1983. The findings supported the restrictive policy in place at the time, but the practice of crossdecking women SWOs from non-combatants to combatants via temporary assigned duty orders (TAD) was revitalized. This was to provide an improved opportunity for women to be trained in warfare areas not normally associated with the ships included in the list deemed suitable for women (tenders, repair and salvage ships). This enhanced the ability of motivated women to obtain SWO qualifications and warfare proficiency. Authorization for women helicopter pilots to be assigned TAD on Sixth and Seventh Fleet ships was also granted in an expanded version of the "TAD" policy. This would give the female pilots the experience of flying underway replenishment missions in support of deployed naval forces. These increased



training opportunities greatly enhanced the female pilot's capabilities and readiness in the operational environment. (U.S. Navy Study, 1987)

#### **7. 1984: Still No MLSF, But More/Better Shore Billets**

Again, in 1984, the practice of not assigning women to MLSF ships was reviewed by the Department of the Navy and again it was supported. The Navy made a decision to review this policy annually to ensure it was appropriate and reflected the desires "mandated by the American People through Congress." (U.S. Navy Study, 1987, p. 1-21) Destroyer tenders and repair ships once again began 6 month deployment cycles though. This improved the female officer's chances of qualifying as SWO on her own ship. The lack of senior shipboard billets available to women was recognized and shore billets were identified to try and lessen the impact of this deficiency. A study conducted by the Navy stated:

Experience-enhancing, post-department head opportunities ashore, which would serve as partial compensation for the lack of availability of senior shipboard billets, were identified. Women would be screened for these shore leadership tours by the existing LCDR XO and CDR CO boards. Assignment to CO/XO tours ashore was to be in warfare related support billets in commands such as SIMAs (Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activities), Readiness Support Groups (RSG) and the MSC (Military Sealift Command). (U.S. Navy Study, 1987, pg 1-22)

A General Unrestricted Line (Gen URL) Study recommended major changes to the career path for Gen URL Officers. This was to include ensuring three quarters of the LCDR and CO/XO,



designator 1000, billets were reserved for Gen URL assignment. This was done to guarantee an equitable promotion possibility existed for Gen URLs to the grade of O-6. (U.S. Navy Study, 1987)

#### **8. 1985-1987: XO Billets and MPS Squadrons Open**

In 1985 a woman was assigned as XO of a Naval Station and regulations were changed to allow female LCDRs, who had been screened for XO afloat, to fill Commander billets for XO on tenders (this policy was mirrored for males on combatants). The practice of not assigning women to MLSF ships was again reviewed and supported, it was determined that Congress would have to mandate the change if it were to happen. (U.S. Navy Study, 1987)

After further study, the Secretary of the Navy authorized women to be assigned to replenishment ships and the Maritime Prepositioning Ship (MPS) squadrons in 1986. Women were also authorized to stay aboard ship until 20th week of pregnancy, as long as no underway periods were involved. (U.S. Navy Study, 1987)

In 1987 the Navy had women holding positions as XO on tenders, salvage ships and mine sweeps. In an effort to improve the detailing process (the way officers are assigned to billets), Gen URL's began their own branch for detailing their own officers separately from the line community.

## **9. 1987: Study on Progress of Women in the Navy**

The SECNAV directed that the CNO convene a study group to conduct a comprehensive examination of the assimilation of women into the Navy. The study found that:

During the 1972-1987 period, the Navy has successfully managed the rapid introduction of large numbers of women into what has historically been a conservative, predominantly male organization. The number of women has increased from about 9,000 (1.5%) in 1972 to over 54,000 (9%) today (1987)... (U.S. Navy Study, 1987, p. ES-7)

Two common themes emerge within the analysis. First, women are succeeding. Second, policies are evolving to keep pace with women's growing numbers, seniority, expectations, and success. The historical record suggests that these trends will continue as the utilization of women in the Navy increases.

## **10. 1988: Billets Open to Women Finally Expand**

A momentous event occurred with respect to women's opportunities in 1988, when Fleet Air Reconnaissance Squadrons, VQ-1 and VQ-2, fleet oilers, ammunition ships and ships of the Combat Logistics Force (CLF), formerly called the MLSF, were opened for the assignment of women on a permanent basis. Not only did the number of sea billets for women increase by 646 and 3,714 billets for officer and enlisted, respectively, but this now gave females a viable career path at sea. The first woman SWO was screened for commander command afloat. The "Gen URL" acronym was adopted, vice

"GURL" for obvious reasons. (U.S. Navy Update Report, 1990, pp. ES1-ES38)

### **11. 1989: More Progress for Women**

In 1989, the rules governing pregnant women afloat were changed so that women could remain onboard at sea, as long as they were within three hours of medical evacuation (MEDEVAC) to a treatment facility. Also the first female was assigned as a Command Master Chief afloat. The first Navy fraternization instruction, OPNAVINST 5370.2 was signed and implemented. An updated SECNAVINST 1300.2A revised the definition of combat mission to cause fewer billets to exclude female assignment. (U.S. Navy Update Report, 1990, pp. I-1 to I-60)

## **G. 1990's: THE PROMISE OF A GENDER NEUTRAL NAVY**

### **1. A Smooth Start to the Decade**

What has already proven to be a remarkable decade as far as women's rights and society's awareness of the problems caused by sexual harassment and institutionalized gender bias, started out smoothly. The Gen URL community issued a mission statement in 1990, and the MEDEVAC requirement was extended to 6 hours. Physician Assistants received training in OB/GYN care and were placed on ships with more than 80 women aboard. Women Gen URL began to take command of large shore establishments, like Naval Stations Treasure Island and Long Beach. The first women to take command of an air squadron and

assume command afloat did so in the first year of the new decade. Then came the scandal which caused a Secretary of the Navy to resign, several admirals to leave the service and a multi-million dollar investigation which will lead to the courts martials of many Navy and Marine Corps Officers, TAILHOOK.

## **2. TAILHOOK**

The annual TAILHOOK convention (the association of naval aviators who operate off aircraft carriers) held in Las Vegas, Nevada got out of control and several women were assaulted. One of the victims was an aide to an admiral participating in the conference. She felt the Navy mishandled her complaint and went public with her allegations. The resulting publicity and realization that ethics and morals had deteriorated at some level caused an intense self review of policies by Department of Defense officials. The far reaching effects of this scandal are still being felt as this study is completed.

## **3. 1993: Equality for Women on the Horizon**

On 26 April, 1993, President Clinton's Secretary of Defense, Les Aspin, announced that women will be allowed to fly in combat roles and sail on combatant ships as soon as possible. Congress must decide what roles, if any, will be kept off limits to women. The current general consensus of opinion, as portrayed in the press, is that women will be

allowed on combatant naval vessels and combat aircraft within the year, but the issue of women in combat ground units will need much more study before Congress will decide on that part of the issue.

#### **4. Current Demographics**

The Navy culture has radically changed over the last fifty years. Women have become more fully integrated today than the previous generation of naval officers dreamed possible or appropriate. The women in the Navy of 1993 number 8,400 officers, 2,500 chief petty officers and 46,700 other enlisted comprising almost 11% of the force. Their ranks include Rear Admirals Marsha Evans, Louise Willmot (both Gen URL), Mariann Stratton (Nurse Corps) and Rear Admirals (select) Katherine Laughton and Patricia Tracey (both Gen URL). While not yet on combatants, women are at sea at a level of 360 officers, 490 chief petty officers and 8000 enlisted. The percentage filling these sea billets is 4.3%, 19.6% and 17% of all female officers, chiefs and petty officers, respectively. The Marine Corps has 649 women officers and 7,737 women enlisted comprising 4.5% of all regular Marines. Of the 102 enlisted ratings in the Navy, 28 remain closed to women. These 28 are in the fields of nuclear and submarine trades, electronic warfare operators (air and surface), rates that operate navy guns, missiles and sonars aboard ships and those associated with shipboard gas turbine



engines. In the Marine Corps, approximately 80% of the operational specialties are open to women. About 50% of the women are assigned to specialties in personnel, logistic or administration communities and none are in infantry, field artillery, tank, assault craft or other combat related jobs. (Navy Times, 10 May 1993, pp. 12-13)

#### **5. Gender Neutral Navy Promised**

It is now expected to see women on the annual astronaut selection list Secretary Aspin and the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Frank B. Kelso II, are pushing for a "gender neutral" Navy within the next few years. The paradigm has shifted and it is time to press on with what the future will have in store for a gender equal Navy. As Admiral Kelso said in a speech to a retired officer convention on 27 April, 1993, "The Navy is ready to go, I think it is time to get on with it." In less than a year from that speech, it is presumed that women will be joining the fleet squadrons and surface combatants will be outfitting to take on gender integrated crews.

## **IV. ANALYSIS**

### **A. OVERVIEW**

The analysis of the data in this study yielded ten prominent themes. These themes are presented along with supporting justifications drawn from the interviews. Each justification is reinforced with interview quotations which exemplify the various opinions of officers from different communities in the Navy and Marine Corps.

### **B. THEME I: A HIERARCHY OF JOBS IN THE NAVY**

#### **1. Theme**

The Navy, like most large organizations, has a hierarchy of jobs. The upper hierarchy being traditionally, and/or by law, all male combined with other subtle symbolic differences create distinct divisions of importance or masculinity.

#### **2. Justification**

The Navy is a war fighting organization. Its combat roles, regardless of specific community, involved in fighting the enemy are considered the most important jobs. Combat roles create the highest risk for loss of life and are usually the most exciting and adventuresome careers anywhere. All other non-combat type jobs fall into a support role. These are often viewed as less essential and have the primary

purpose of assisting the "combat warriors". One F-14 NFO (Naval Flight Officer) stated (E046):

If you don't have a warfare specialty, be it surface warfare, fighter, attack, or ASW (anti-submarine warfare) then it's not the same thing.

Thus in the simplest of terms, there is a major difference of relative importance between these roles.

Combat roles have been an all-male environment. The sacrifice and achievements of these people have preserved the American way of life. Their efforts has been glamorized through the years in literature, folklore, and Hollywood films. The addition of women to the military, their exclusion from combat jobs, and integration into the support field, widened the division between combat and support roles. It has also reinforced the belief that combat roles are for men only. As one pilot (E009) stated:

I think it's more that women can stay in the Navy without it (warfare specialties), because of the combat exclusion and all that. It doesn't hurt a woman not to have a warfare specialty. Whereas it does hurt a man. You are being compared to a man who has a warfare specialty, and yes if you are a man that can't fight a war, then the Navy is not going to keep you.

Since women are perceived to be less effective by many men, and they are assigned to support type jobs, these jobs become viewed as being less physical, difficult, or important in the overall mission.

The amount of training required is another factor which is used to measure the importance associated with a type of job, regardless of whether it is in the combat or support category. The Navy has more of an investment in personnel who perform jobs which require extensive and very expensive training such as aviation. This education or training is often looked at as a fringe benefit that adds value to the individual who receives it. One pilot (E009) explains why his wife transferred from Navy Intelligence to the 1100 community so their chances of being stationed in the same area were better, vice himself transferring from being a pilot to another community:

We talked about it, but it was never even a consideration. Looking at the two options, I could step down. I could become, I don't know what I would have done. But for me to go from being a pilot to something else, not only would it be a loss of flight pay which is fairly significant, but also it would have been a lot more of a sacrifice. Basically my career would have been over is what I'm trying to say. For her to go from intelligence to 1100, they might question why she did it. But for me to go from pilot to 1100, or pilot to intelligence, or pilot to something else, my career would have been over. Because I would be a man without a warfare specialty. I would be a man that gave up a warfare specialty. I think it's fairly common knowledge, I don't know whether it's true or not, but people have the perception that if you're a man and you don't have a warfare specialty, then you are not going to get promoted to commander.

If a person can step right in and do a job without training, it is considered something that anyone can do. If no specialized training is required, then no additional value is added to the individual who will be ordered to that position.

If one person is considered less valuable an asset to the organization than another, due to job assignment and training, a job hierarchy is established and supported. Support jobs that require lengthy training (Medical, Supply, or Judge Advocate General Corps) before one becomes qualified can be viewed as more important than jobs that require little or no training (administrative type jobs).

Technological advances have made modern warfare and machines more complex. Thus, these communities have extensive training programs to qualify its personnel. Nuclear trained officers and aviation communities have training that can last several years before their personnel reach their fleet assignments. Submariners and nuclear surface warfare officers must become nuclear power qualified and attend submarine or surface warfare schools respectively. Aviators must learn to fly and operate weapons systems before they enter the fleet. However, women aviators are limited to combat support roles and can not enter aviation communities that have warfare specialties. These increased training costs are high and the Navy, like any organization, does not want to lose their investment in these highly qualified people to the civilian sector. These personnel are paid more than their contemporaries through additional submarine or flight pay (Military Pay Manual, DoD 7000.14-R,1993). They can also be eligible for career incentive bonuses that aren't offered to lesser trained jobs. In the case of aviation, the Navy



requires service obligations of two to three years longer from these personnel to get more of a return from the extensive training investment. This procedure helped eliminate personnel shortages in the past and makes sound financial sense. This is similar to the fact that various employees make different salaries in the private sector depending on the tasks they perform. This system definitely establishes a hierarchy of jobs in the Navy. Since women have been denied into the submarine community and are limited in their aviation and surface roles, they are excluded from most of the jobs in the upper level of hierarchy.

Women are not only separated by being excluded from certain jobs, but also by what they accomplish in their non-combatant career paths. For example, women attend the same surface warfare officer school (SWOS) as the men. However, when women qualify for the Surface Warfare Pin during their first tour after SWOS, the qualification requirement for weapons systems and tactics are waived because they are on non-combat ships. Male surface warfare officers often view the women receiving the same pin with fewer qualifications as a lesser accomplishment. Women who receive medals are also viewed as getting rewarded for much less difficult jobs. As one surface warfare officer (E004) stated:

You look around and see another female lieutenant with various medals. You know that they have never spent a day in the fleet since being commissioned. It makes you wonder what magic, fantastic things they did. It makes

you kind of wonder at the relative weight or fairness of the award system.

Women are also separated by their uniforms. One pilot (E010) said:

There are too many rules that set women aside. Their uniforms set them aside. If you start making rules that set people aside, you will have inherent animosity.

The insignias showing their rank are smaller than the males (U.S. Navy Uniform Regulations, NAVPERS 15665H, 1991). It can be perceived that the women's rank is less significant. Female belt buckles are also smaller than the males. So if a command makes up their own special unit belt buckles, it won't fit the women's uniform unless they ordered two different sizes. Because there are usually far fewer women in a particular command, the price per belt buckle for the women's style is often uneconomical. These subtle differences are probably done for better appearance for the "average" smaller uniform sizes of the women. However, there are small men and large women. If body size is the reason to have the two uniform standards, these items will be disproportionate for their uniforms of the "non-average" today. Women are also permitted to wear more varieties of covers (hats) than men (U.S. Navy Uniform Regulations, NAVPERS 15665H, 1991). This may be considered a good deal, tradition, or stylish for the women, but those that wear them are separating themselves from the unit. Uniforms are meant to make everyone appear the same

and promote camaraderie. Small variations are made for traditional communities or working uniforms. These broader variations set women apart as their own group. There are enough institutional divisions in large organizations. It would be beneficial to make the uniforms, rank insignias, and accessories as equal as possible with only necessary exceptions.

## **C. THEME II: FULL INTEGRATION WITH ONE STANDARD**

### **1. Theme**

Men that have experience with women professionally feel they should be allowed in all communities/specialties in the Navy and Marine Corps, as long as they meet a meaningful standard required for job performance.

### **2. Justification**

Of male officers interviewed, 85.7% of those that had experience in the operational environment with women felt they should be fully integrated in all communities of the Navy and Marine Corps. The other 14.3% of the males with gender integrated backgrounds noted specific individual females who had caused strong negative images about a females capability in combat roles. Also, of these males who oppose full integration, none had what could be considered significant exposure to military women on the job. All but one had only one integrated tour with over 90% of these commands' demographic make up being male.

Several of the officers who feel women should receive equal status gave examples of incidents which proved to them that women could perform effectively. One pilot interviewed (E034) had operational experience with females aboard an aircraft carrier. This excerpt supports their presence in this scenario:

In HS-4 we brought the carrier from Norfolk around the horn to be based in San Diego. We had women on the ship for that evolution. We kept the C-2 DET (detachment) on board the whole time. They had women pilots and maintenance personnel. They were there for all the logistic runs.

When he was asked if he noticed any difference on the flight deck with women working on it, he replied:

No. I don't think it was a problem as far as that is concerned. They separated berthing and gave them their own head. One of the female pilots was one of my plebes at USNA. She was the detachment (DET) Officer in Charge. They had two female pilots and three or four male pilots. Carriers don't have DET's. So as a LT she was getting the same respect as squadron CO's and XO's who were Commanders....I don't see a problem as long as they can do the job....Just make sure they are physically capable to do their job. Just like the men. If they can't cut it they shouldn't be there....I don't see a problem with them flying (in combat situations). If they can fly well, they should be there. If they can't, then they shouldn't be there. They shouldn't be there just because they are a woman, and they want to make a statement. Which might happen initially. There are probably some women who slipped through flight school just because they are women. The only problem I can see is berthing on a ship.

Another example given, this time by a Marine during Operation Desert Storm (B012), also substantiates this feeling of equality:



I happened to be in the Operations Center, Captains... would cycle through the Operations Center and would run the Squadron and defense of the Squadron...you have an assistant Lieutenant ...One night during one of the missile attacks, we had gotten the word that this was a gas attack. The assistant was this female LT...While everyone else was running for cover, she was literally on the sound powered phones calling all the on line units saying "Hey this is a possible gas attack, go to MOP level four (highest state of alert for chemical defense)." We did not know what it was yet, and she acted with a very clear conscience and clear definition of taking care of the troops, that airfield was massive. We had an ammo dump that was, of course, separated from everything by 3 or 4 miles. We were their link with the outside world. She was doing the thing that Marines are supposed to do. She was making clear decisions in a crisis, reducing casualties and win the fight....Two hours later we found male Marines cowering in the corner with their gas masks still on.

Although this Captain saw many problems resulting from non equitable treatment of the women with him in Saudi Arabia, his overall view is to integrate as much as possible and treat all marines fairly. His major concern was privacy for males and females, not differences in capabilities. A navy pilot talking about women at the Naval Academy (E013) mentioned that he thought women could be included in any group. He said:

I really had no opposition to women being part of the group, as long as they performed to the standards that the men do. There is no reason why they can't belong to the group. There are some men out there that have sub-standard performances. I would look just as harshly at them as I would the women with sub-standard performances.

Of those who promoted equitable assignment of women and men to all billets in the Navy and Marine Corps, the message about true equality was clear. If women are allowed



into combat roles, they must adhere to the same standards as the males. A Navy helicopter pilot (E005) put it like this:

I believe women are here to stay. If they are going to be in the Navy, then they should have to do the same jobs that a man has to do....When a female goes into a rating, she should be pretty much aware of whether or not she'll be capable of doing that job. If she's not able to, then swap her out to a different rate or make her get out.

A Surface Warfare Lieutenant (B007) told of his concerns which also had to do with equitable standards:

My whole hang-up is if a person is capable of doing the job, whatever that job requires, I mean if it requires opening a 100 pound hatch to free somebody or fight battle damage, pulling a fire hose, etc., if a person can do the job, male or female, I have no problem.

A Civil Engineer Officer and former Surface Warfare Officer from the Naval Academy (B015) said:

I think women and men can do the same work, if they meet the same criteria for the job. Now, I do not know, but I think a larger percentage of men can meet, what I consider, the criteria for going into ground combat, but if the man or woman does meet that specification then let them do the job if they want. I am all for letting women go and die along with the men, I don't think the older generation of our society is quite ready for that though. I think there should be some stipulation though for a family with children, that only one parent can serve in a combat role. Even if they both want to, because it just is not fair for a child to lose both parents. It would be hard enough to lose one. I remember growing up, living on base during Vietnam with my Dad. When one of my friends' dads was reported missing or killed, it was important for the mom to be there and try to pick up the pieces and give my friend something to hang on to. It is tough to lose a parent, but it does not matter which one, I think, in today's world. It is equally bad to lose mom or dad, but hell no don't let the kid lose both.

This Navy Pilot (E013) who had very limited exposure to women in the aviation community, but who worked with some while he was attached to a staff said:

I think it would be biased for me to say that women should be screened before they come out to combat ships more than men should. I really don't believe that. Like I said it should be the best person for the job. I think there should be more screening for people going out to combat jobs, because it's not a situation for all people....Another problem that we had in the past was that women were filling the admin side of the Navy. They were taking all the shore billets leaving the guys at sea. If you want to be equal then you have to spend equal time at both places. The only question I have in the future is if you have equality and the need for a draft arises. Are you going to draft just men, men and women, or just men and women who want to belong?

The desire is to create a standard that is indicative of the requirements one must fulfill to successfully complete the tasks associated with the billet. Some of the feelings of those interviewed are contained in the following quotes from males who had previously served with women. A Lieutenant Commander in the Supply Corps (B001) said:

I think that very few exceptions of females could not do the same job as males. I have seen female boatswains mates doing the same job as males....We will not have an equitable Navy until we put more women out to sea in the roles that are now only staffed with males. I think it (something General Colin Powell could do to help the military) would be to just do away with all gender based discrimination all together and open up all billets and all roles regardless of gender. Let people do what they are capable of doing...I think it should be all fair game, including combat for women.

A Lieutenant Navy Flight Officer (NFO) (B010) stated:

I do not see why (women should) not (be allowed in combat). I think their physical strength, on average, would be the biggest problem. You know, carrying loads that marines or armies have to carry and so forth. But, if a standard was put in place, a meaningful standard, that you had to surpass, whether male or female, to go into a combat role, then I think it would be no problem. Now, you will have a smaller percentage of women than men that could pass the standard, but your force would not be weakened.

This NFO also spoke of one of the many instances which proved to him women could do the job. He said:

We had a mix of very junior males and females, enlisted, that worked together. The mix was about 50-50. Here they were doing life threatening tasks, turning engines and propellers, and regardless of sex they had to work together. The director, male or female, had to rely on other people, male or female...they worked well together. That was a good example of males and females working together....the men and women worked with equal productivity. It was definitely beneficial....men worked side by side with women, there was no problem.

One marine who feels there are some differences in capabilities as far as average women versus average men, still feels some women should be allowed into combat roles. This Captain (E015), with some professional experience with females, felt this way about women in the military:

Back when I was the legal officer for a couple of months, the regimental legal officer was a female captain. She was very professional and we got along fine. I didn't see any problems there in a garrison administrative setting. The physical thing wasn't an issue. I worked very close with her getting various packages, administrative discharges. I still think the physical aspect of things like infantry, artillery. For instance, when you are shooting artillery rounds. You have to move 100 pound rounds from the truck to the gun position, and then into the howitzer. One person takes the shell from the truck

about 25 yards to the gun. Then two people load it in. It's a lot of weight and a lot of work. If a female can do that fine, but I don't think there is going to be a whole lot of them....I've seen both sides in the field all grungy sleeping in the cold rain. Humping over the hills, it's just physically draining. I sure some females can handle that, but probably not many. I think it might cause some problems trying to keep up with the other Marines. I don't know how much of that male bonding thing affects unit morale. I know it does to some extent. But I don't think it would be much of a problem if women are there. So it's more of a physical thing than anything. The one thing I don't want to see is the standards lowered. If they can at least maintain the standards or even make them tougher to make the units better, I'm all for it.

More exposure to women allows men to see first hand that women are capable of doing well. A Surface Line Officer (E025) who only had professional interactions with women at the Naval Academy and at the Naval Postgraduate School agrees with this theme from the fleet perspective. He stated:

It (the integration of women) will only get better when the people that have been here the longest get out. When you start having people with better attitudes that have been exposed to women all along, you'll start to see it pan out. The problem is trying to teach old dogs new tricks. Some of those guys are so resistant to it they won't even listen to rational arguments. I think we had the same problems with the integration of minorities in the 40's. It took awhile. I think we are pretty good now, but even 20 years ago it was still horrible. Once we start seeing women in command of ships. Women master divers, chief engineers. Once we get more senior and everyone will see stuff like that, I think it will go away.

He also recounted his experience aboard a Navy ship where he observed females from other commands assist in repair efforts:



There was a woman on a tender in Mayport in a position of authority. I can't remember her exact position, but she was a chief or senior chief. She was very very good. She could mediate problems between ships getting fixed, and all the other intricacies involved in that kind of job. She was very good at it. I also saw it when our ship pulled into New Jersey when our fuel oil transfer pump broke. We only have one pump. We had to be underway they next day. We were taking on weapons and going to the ASW range. So it was Friday night and three female Navy BT's (boiler techs) who were on duty there came on the ship and fixed the damn thing in about six hours. They came out, ripped it out, changed it out, put it back together, and it was done. If we want real equality you have to open up everything to everybody. All women and all men fight for the same jobs. That's the bottom line. If we don't want real equality, keep it the way it is.

Another Lieutenant Surface Warfare Officer (E033) had no women in previous commands, all sea duty. His point of view changed from interaction with females at the Naval Postgraduate School. This was evident in his comment about what he thought of women at the Naval Postgraduate School:

Very professional and knowledgeable. I have had one instructor who was a female officer. I enjoyed her class. I guess I was a little bit bias when I first got here because I was on a combatant and you just hear about the women taking all the shore jobs. It gives you a different perspective of them being here at NPS. Maybe if we implement them in all ships, that would ease that stereotype that they have. Just working with them here gives you more of a neutral stand, and I'm willing to give women at sea a shot. That may surprise people that have known me in the past. Just seeing them here has left me with a good impression.

When asked if he would have a problem with the women here being fellow division officers on the ship, he answered:



No. I don't think it would be any problem. The problems may be with their subordinates, but that is just a change in attitude.

Increased interaction between the genders can improve working relationships and adjust perceptions. This Navy pilot (B038) had experienced a few enlisted women with some conduct problems in his last squadron. Because of this, he came to the Naval Postgraduate School with negative feelings about women in the military. Now he says:

My opinion of women in the Navy increased significantly when I first got to NPS. Because I ran into two women aviators who are very competent and that I have a lot of respect for.... My opinion changes all the time and it is greatly affected by the women at that command. I'm open minded. Had I not been exposed to all the problems with the enlisted women in a VP squadron, my opinion would probably be a lot better. But it has gotten better because of the women here.

Although these men feel women should be integrated further, some did warn of difficulties that will ensue. A Commander (B005) who graduated from the Naval Academy and flies the P-3 Orions felt that gender should not be an issue. He stated:

...if you are professional, it makes no difference to me what your race or gender is. Those are not real lofty standards, at least I do not think they are. To me that is not important. I do not care what you look like, to me that doesn't really matter. It is just what kind of job you do, how you perform.

However, he does feel there will be growing pains associated with the integration. This thought was evident when he said:

I have seen instances where incorporating women into VP squadrons caused a lot of pain. Both for them and for the males, but those are just growing pains. Whenever you introduce change there is going to be pain associated with it.

It is clear that those male officers with professional experience serving with female military personnel are adamant that women should be more fully integrated, including combat roles, as long as current standards of performance are maintained. It is also evident that some men with limited exposure to women in their careers feel the same way. As one Lieutenant Submarine Officer (B046), who only interacted with women when his submarine would tie up next to a tender for maintenance, said:

Combat is no place for a women. However, it is also no place for a man. I think that when someone gets part of their body mutilated or is killed from an act of violence resulting from a war it is just as heinous whether they be male or female. It is my opinion, that a given woman can shoot, or be hit by, a projectile just as well as a given man can. We, in the military, all get paid to manage violence. To do that you have to enter the place that violence is occurring. If you are restricted from that then you should not be in the military. If you are to be restricted, then there should be a darn good reason. The fact is there is no reason to exclude women, thus they should be allowed to fight, be heros, witness the exhilaration, kill and be killed. That would be equitable for men and women. That is what would be the fairest, assuming going to war can be considered fair.

These feelings indicate that many men feel the best thing for all in the military is to integrate women much more fully in the Navy and Marine Corps, as long as one standard is maintained.

#### **D. THEME III: WOMEN CAUSE PROBLEMS**

##### **1. Theme**

Women are the cause of problems that would not exist if they were not integrated into a unit.

##### **2. Justification**

Virtually every officer interviewed, felt that women would bring new problems to the military community that was newly opened to them. Those that had worked regularly with women in the past were prone to believe that these new problems could be overcome fairly easily. Many felt that the problems were endemic to the integration of females, but were worth encountering to allow women the ability to be treated equally. Those officers who felt these problems could not be conquered had little experience with women in their careers. For the most part, the problems cited concerned the logistical aspects of women in rugged or hostile environments. Men feel that the military will require a greater logistic infrastructure to support the needs of women in the combat zone. This increased infrastructure does not exist in a purely male environment. The need for feminine hygiene products, enclosed showers or toilet facilities, separate tents and extra water to allow for sanitation during the menstrual cycle have all been mentioned as concerns.

Problems that would result as a consequence of maintaining privacy while fulfilling billeting and sanitary

requirements were the most common of those noted in the interviews. As one Surface Warfare Officer (B007) stated:

You are going to break the unit integrity of OI division (a portion of the Operations Department of a ship) because you are not going to have OI division berthing. You will have the boys in OI down in OI division berthing and the Lasses of OI up in ladies berthing....Then there is the female head issue and all that stuff.

A Submariner we interviewed (B047) conveyed that he felt it would be impossible to maintain privacy on smaller ships, especially submarines with mixed gender crews. He said:

With only four staterooms for twelve officers it would be hard to have a separate compartment for women. I am sure it would be easier on a surface ship though. The one thing that would cause big problems is middle of the night General Quarters drills with lights out. I know now most of the crew runs around in their skivvies during the first part of these drills at least. It would be mighty interesting to answer the Congressional inquiries as to why a male saw a female in her panties and bra. Do we start sleeping fully clothed?

There were many other instances where these concerns were voiced both from the at-sea perspective and from the shore viewpoint of the Marines.

Other problems were also expressed as concerns. When he was at NAS Miramar, a Lieutenant pilot (E041) saw some problems generated from having females in the command due to physical limitations. He commented:

They had problems physically because there were big parts that they couldn't lift. There were pregnancies and



associated health problems that were more prevalent. Men are more receptive to following orders in general. In general, I seemed to have more women that didn't like to follow orders. Maybe it was just the group I had. We had a case of fraternization between a pilot and a female enlisted. He went to mast and got hammered. The female got minor punishment....(On detachments, the women) did fine. They worked hard. Some physical jobs just gave them problems.

He also used these problems as reasons for his belief that women should be kept out of combat roles when he said:

I'm personally against it (women in combat). From the way I was brought up. You take care of and watch out for women more. If we are going to put women in combat then we need to do it completely. Put them everywhere and don't give them the option of whether to go. That's totally an inequality we don't need. Men don't have that option. It may cause unit cohesion problems and additional health care problems. It may cause more problems than benefits.

Another Navy pilot (E005) described problems associated with women in the following quote:

I was in charge of in maintenance, there was some animosity between the men and the females in my division because the females wouldn't do the heavy work that was required. They would always get one of the guys to carry the heavy equipment. Most of the problems came on the social side of the house. Some of the guys were upset because at HS-10 a large majority of the women seemed to be pregnant. Of course they couldn't do as much work when they were. Also we had an incident where one of the officers was dating one of the enlisted females which caused quite a stir in the wardroom. The CO saw them together one time and basically, I'm not sure of the details, but the officer was verbally talked to. They ended up getting married so I don't know where that stands. The rest of the officers got a verbal lashing for letting it go on which really didn't apply because they kept it secret. Until the one time where they showed up to a function together, which was a below in head work (thinking) for the guy obviously. I think there was a



little jealousy that went on. Some of the guys resented the attention that some of the females got at work sometimes.

Stationed in Patuxent River Maryland, yet another Navy pilot (E012) saw women as the cause of personnel shortages due to their desire to be with a new spouse. He recalled:

So a lot of the JO's (junior officers) would end up getting married to someone they met in Pensacola, or college. What would happen a lot of times was that the women would marry pilots from other communities like F-14 or helos and these guys were stationed in Norfolk or Oceana. That would cause a lot of heartache because Pax River is so far removed from the Navy. There ...What I think was kind of resented was that we had a couple of CO's who granted humanitarian transfers. By doing that and allowing the person to transfer, BUPERS doesn't recognize that as a vacant billet until that person's normal transfer time comes up. So you don't get a replacement for maybe a couple of years. So you're sucking wind because you are short another pilot or NFO. The CO's are in a tough position because if they don't let them go, they have an unhappy camper who doesn't want to be there. If they do let them go, squadron readiness will take a hit. We had some serious problems trying to man all the DET's. They problem snow balls because you may have to have some people deploy on more than one crew DET. They come back from one DET and a couple of days later deploy with another DET. That was a major stumbling block to keeping morale up. I saw a major nose dive in squadron morale.

Although a Marine Major (B030) felt women should be allowed in combat, he cited the feeling that roles women could perform in combat had to be managed carefully. In his words:

I have seen some gals in combat situations do extraordinary things, they also raise extraordinary concerns and other issues. I feel it (combat assignment for women) is individual in nature and should be taken on a case by case basis. It can work, but in other instances

it does not work....(This is) because of the logistic problems they cause or create. It would have made my job significantly harder, in terms of supporting them logistically. We were already at the logistic capacity of the combat transport system and we were already doing without a lot of things deemed important for military operations. If I had to add on to that the extra requirements of the women, no way, even just the toilet kit articles (tampons, sanitary napkins, yeast infection medicine, douches) that they would need would be a greater burden on the logistic support (it would require additional space for transport and storage, space that did not exist). Add to that additional toilet facilities and the requirement to maintain privacy, therefore requiring enhanced heavier, larger (with walls) toilet facilities (many times there was no latrine facility and no vegetation in Saudi Arabia, thus no privacy). Segregation, then when you consider other issues such as command and leadership, it is a whole other group of issues that you have to accept....You can make it work, but at what price? the price of readiness? I hope not.

Another Marine, a Captain Combat Engineer (B012), described some of the problems he encountered because women were in his unit, in Saudi Arabia, during Desert Storm. He recalled:

The XO (Executive Officer) was a very traditional, old ideology Marine. He said "She is a female first, before she is an Officer. I am not going to make that concession to her (give her a two person tent to share with the senior female Non-commissioned Officer). She will stay where she is (in a tent which housed all females, both enlisted and officer) and the other tent (a two person tent) will go unused."...I stated my ideas, which I thought were the traditional 'this is what is best for the Marine Corps' sort of idea. The XO went off on what I feel was an emotional tangent. He said "she is a woman, she doesn't deserve this (the new tent)."...The Commanding Officer's final decision was to put a blanket up in the male officers' tent and had the female in with them. ...This is what happened, so we had a co-ed tent which ultimately destroyed the morale of the unit....It really tore the unit apart emotionally. Those scars were so deep that when I left the unit there were still harsh feelings about it....It pulled at the corps values of the unit.

This same Marine (B012) felt that women also caused problems in the beginning of his training. As he was describing what it was like to have women in his Basic School class at Quantico, VA, he told us that:

It was unusual, because, how do you say this gracefully, of course you are a young and brand new in the Marine Corps. A lot of preconceived notions go with that. You know you are a rough, tough, hard drinking Marine. The females spoiled that image for us. They were referred to as the concubine platoon. A lot of the male Marines were bragging about personal sexual relationships with many of the female Marines.

This last quote touches yet another problem area that men feel will be created along with the introduction of women. That is sexual misconduct or temptation and the personnel problems associated with it. According to a Navy Supply Officer (B001), who used to be a Surface Warfare Officer:

You won't see the Navy dealing with the fact that once we go on cruise, because most of the females will pair up with males, there will be fights onboard, for relationships.

A Naval Flight Officer (B010) who had two women onboard an aircraft carrier for a portion of his assignment aboard, described the problems associated with one of the women as:

...the Lieutenant Commander would douse herself with perfume and walk down the passageway. Jesus, you don't do that. 5000 men who have been at sea for months and suddenly there is a woman with all this perfume? It just was not fair for these men, who were cooped up, to be subjected to that smell that is so closely attached to sensual times and thoughts. It drove most of us crazy.

Even though support ships have been integrated for several years, the perception that this misconduct will occur is prevalent. A Navy pilot with little professional interaction with women (E013) expressed this opinion when he said:

I guess the question behind that is can women handle combat situations. I believe anybody can focus themselves to do the job when the time comes. It's the in-between time that I worry about. Not so much can Susie work the pumps during general quarters, but what are Susie and Johnny doing during their off time. There are a lot of places to hide on a carrier. Call me untrusting, but I think given the opportunity people will take advantage of it.

Officers also say this potential problem exists at shore facilities as well. While commenting on problems he had faced as a result of having women in his squadron, a Lieutenant Naval Aviator (E038) recalled:

As far as officers, we had three women. They were in aviation maintenance or admin or intel. They didn't (fit in)....The ground pounder maintenance types; there was always a conflict of interest. I had several run-ins with them....The one (problem with female maintenance personnel) that sticks out the most was a chief was soliciting sexual favors from a subordinate female. It got front office attention. The guy went to captain's mast and got busted in rank and fined money. In a VP squadron you are land based. You would have operational tempo type of deployments, but you still had a lot of time for potential male female interaction. It was well known which enlisted women were sleeping around. It is very different from a ship board environment. I think (having women in the squadron) degraded it (operational readiness) to a certain extent. The amount of time you had to spend with the administrative hassle with a lot of NJP involving sexual misconduct. The sexual misconduct increased in tempo towards the middle of the deployment. It was the same on both deployments.



Some of those interviewed felt women would also bring the alleged problem of prostitution, as the Marine in (B012) alluded to when he said:

I know that men, when talking one-on-one would talk about the fact that they caught females in the desert with lots of money on them from servicing the troops, but you did not talk about that stuff with females around, but a lot of people would talk about things like who was, or might be sleeping with whom when females were not around. If they were around you had to watch what you said. It was a perceived problem I think. It was a common belief though. I remember standing in the Army line to get a pistol, and this staff non-commissioned officer I knew was there. This female MP drove past and he commented that she had been making a lot of money during her nightly patrols. So I would say it was commonly perceived and accepted that this occurred. You believed it was happening, maybe it did, maybe it didn't, I do not know because I don't do that kind of stuff.

Many of the men interviewed included statements which indicated a feeling that women could misunderstand a friendly gesture for an unwelcomed sexual advance or harassment. In the wake of the Tailhook scandal, most male officers fear that they may inadvertently say or do something that will be deemed inappropriate by a female service member. There is a perception that males are thought guilty until proven innocent when it comes to sexual harassment. Because of this, women are seen as a threat that would not exist if they were kept out of an officers' community. The question here is not if the women will be detrimental to the effectiveness of the unit, but, will the introduction of women into their unit hurt



their career? As the previously quoted Supply Corps Officer (B001) states:

That is why I feel it is very, very dangerous right now in the Navy. People can't joke like they used to in the past. They have to be very careful about women.

The Marine Captain who spoke of Saudi Arabia and Quantico (B012) also revealed:

...But, particularly since Tailhook, here at (Naval Postgraduate) school, I am afraid to talk to women, because I am afraid I might say, without intent, they might construe as sexual harassment or verbal harassment, and now with one shot and you are out, I am afraid to jeopardize my career. I worked closely with a female Naval Officer cause she was great at accounting, and since the order came out, I will only say hello to her and that will be the end of what started out as a good working relationship.

The pilot in interview B005 saw areas of concern while traveling with women in his detachment:

When we had female maintenance technicians that when we took a detachment on the road they would travel with us too, so that is why I say there might be some problems. There were some billeting problems. There were some problems in some of the Arab countries about females in the military.

However, B005 ended the discussion with overall support for women's full integration. He emphasized this point when he said:

But as far as working together on an airplane, I do not think there would be a problem.

Pregnancy was mentioned adversely many times. Even though studies have proven women miss fewer work days, inclusive of pregnancies, than do men (Rosenfeld, 1991, pp. 412-414). The men do not only look at days missed from work, they see the decrease in productivity while the women are at work as well. A large portion of those officers interviewed felt women were less reliable due to pregnancy. The Supply Officer (B001) also said:

We have come to expect a lot of problems on the tenders that we do not see on cruisers or destroyers. Females getting pregnant right before deployment. If those females are in a critical billet, like a 'Whiskey III' technician (a technician with highly specialized training of which only one is usually assigned to a ship) and she decides she does not want to go on deployment, we are in trouble.

A P-3 Orion pilot (B005) who believes women should be given the opportunity to be fully integrated in the military mentioned a situation that lends credence to the feelings of the Supply Officer.

I had a female Petty Officer who became pregnant amazingly close to the time for us to deploy. She was left behind. That caused a lot of grumbling down on the hangar deck amongst her male counterparts. As it turned out, the pregnancy was terminated during the deployment and she joined us on deployment. Soon she popped up pregnant again, on deployment. We were on Diego Garcia, and pregnant sailors were not allowed on Diego Garcia because of the facilities. So she left again. That is something that, as an Officer, you have to grapple with.

Although this Naval Aviator (E034) feels strongly that women should be fully integrated in all types of duty, he does cite

some apprehension because of problems associated with pregnancy:

I know a Navy nurse and she was telling me a story about a hospital ship. A bunch of the women corpsmen became pregnant during the deployment. They can't be combat ready if they are all pregnant. It cuts down on the ship's ability to do what they have to do.

A Supply Corps Lieutenant (E041) had experience with women aboard ship. He saw pregnancy as a big problem as he explains:

My second ship was a tender so we had women and there were problems. I heard two women talking about how they needed to get pregnant so they wouldn't have to go on deployment. We lost 10% of the women in the six months preceding the cruise. We lost another 5% on cruise due to pregnancies. That is so costly to the government. Especially on deployment because you have to fly them to hospitals and then you are short handed. It's mostly the enlisted women. They took a few people to mast for sex on the ship, and they were heavily punished. It's going to happen when you put men and women at sea for six months.

A Navy pilot (E013) also talked about the consequences his squadron suffered when women got pregnant and the squadron received no replacement:

...That may be another thing. It just forced everyone to buckle up and take on another job.

Another Navy pilot (E011) agreed by saying:

One problem with women obviously, was that sea duty women that got pregnant would sometime be sent to us. I couldn't use a pregnant woman to do a full job. If she was a mech(anic), she couldn't climb up on an aircraft and change an engine. They couldn't work in the welding shops

or paint shops because of the fumes. Electricians couldn't climb up on the aircraft to do wiring. Ordnance personnel couldn't lift heavy objects. For the most part we put them in the tool room. We had several that could only stand for 3 hours a day. So I would end up taking three light duty pregnant females to cover one eight hour shift. That's pretty much what we did with them. It was quite frustrating. In the HS community we had the attitude that we would do the best with what we had. We were flying old aircraft and not getting the best of everything. Sometimes I got the feeling that's the way they were doing personnel too. But yes I think we could have done better (without women) especially in the shops. I remember of couple of good working females in the shops. They got pregnant, and they were a loss to the shop. It's not like you get replacements for them. I can't take someone else off light duty to replace them and their knowledge. In our business, saying that women can do the same job as men is true, as long as they are not pregnant. Pregnant women cannot do the same job as non-pregnant women. Obviously it's unfair to tell them that they can't get pregnant. That's certainly a legitimate right. Yes it definitely adversely affected us.

Many men feel these problems are all endemic of having women in a unit. The women may be capable of doing the job, but problems can still arise. Sometimes the problem can stem from men who act differently then they would normally when women are part of the organization. If the person in charge is biased against women, a bad situation is inevitable. One example of this is given by the Marine who was in Saudi Arabia (B012). He saw impaired decisions, caused by the presence of women, as a large problem and imparted his sentiments as:

I think that the men will be allowed to have it interfere with their judgement and I saw that in Saudi (the tent episode). Because she was female, the CO and XO let it interfere with the XO's judgment. It will take generations to change those types of things. I think the added stress in combat, when you are in a life or death situation, it puts a lot of stress on you and that makes



personal and emotional commitments become all the more focused and clear. What happens when PFC Susie in A company rifle platoon is sleeping with PFC Jones and PFC Jim is jealous because he wants to sleep with Susie? That just creates more conflict. It creates additional hardships. If you know Jones and Jim are rivals for Susie, you do not want those two in combat. There is no way to stop them from wondering if the other will support him because the other wants Susie.... Jealousy changes peoples actions.

The male majority in the Navy and Marine Corps need to learn about these potential problems before they turn into actual problems. A strategy to correct the deficiencies which cause these problems must be created and promulgated. This will help keep men from making decisions differently than they would if women were not present. These feelings, that women cause problems when integrated into a unit, may be altered with proper policy implementation and more gender integrated work experience. Whether these perceptions are accurate portrayals of reality is not the issue. To realize these perceptions exist is important, so that those involved with women's integration in the future can take them into account.

#### **E. THEME IV: OPPOSITES DO NOT ALWAYS ATTRACT**

##### **1. Theme**

Men find it more difficult to interact with women than other men, both socially and professionally.

##### **2. Justification**

Numerous studies have shown that men and women behave differently in many situations. From the early stages of



infant development and childhood growth male children show different attributes than do their female peers. Young boys normally display communication traits that are not associated with young girls. This difference continues as they grow and mature. The simple trait of maintaining eye contact while talking, differs between the two genders. Males do not need to show, or see, overt signs of focus on a conversation by the other member of the dialogue. On the contrary females have a strong desire to observe focus, primarily through direct eye contact, while communicating. This one trait difference alone can lead to some serious feelings of discomfort when communicating within a heterosexual group. (Tannen, 1990)

Many studies have concluded that males and females have differences in separateness and connectedness. Men are more inclined to differentiate between self and others as well as be more independent. Women tend to show more empathy for others and desire greater intimacy in interpersonal relationships (Choderow, 1978 and Gilligan, 1982). The hypotheses that men and women are completely different in these areas have been statistically demonstrated. Research conducted by the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in Israel found these differences to be significant (Lang-Takac and Osterweil, 1992). Although Israeli society is somewhat different than that of the United States, the fact that these differences are present, even if induced by society, is of importance.

The fact that women look for more intimacy in interpersonal relationships and that males are more apt to view interpersonal relationships in more sexual terms than women (Abbey, 1982; Abbey & Melby, 1986) combined with current apprehensions in the military associated with the Tailhook aftermath create a feeling of reluctance by men to interact with women. A Civil Engineer Officer (B015) who was formerly a Surface Warfare Officer found it more difficult to interact with women. He began by stating a minor burden he felt at Annapolis and ended with the effect he thought Tailhook had:

I would have liked to wake up and go to the head without getting all dressed, but that was just a minor inconvenience. It is certainly justified by allowing women the opportunity to go to the Academy. When I was on my ship we all had to be careful when women were around. Right or wrong, we talked filthy out at sea and amongst ourselves. I am not saying it is appropriate, but it is how we, men, acted. I remember when we got some female Midshipmen onboard for a one day cruise once, we all tried to watch our language. When one of the officers pissed off the XO that day, the XO did not see a female in back of him, he called this guy something about a dripping diseased part of the female anatomy, he was more graphic though. This upset the female midshipman and she went to talk to her officer in charge the next day. My CO was called in and reamed big time by his Commodore, who had been reamed by the Admiral. My XO, well you know how... (trouble)...flows, he was never the same. He ended up being extremely passive and no longer the proactive individual he was before....We probably seemed like a bunch of boring men without a sense of humor....After that I worked with some really good women, I eventually began to act normal, you know, like myself. If I wanted to curse I would, but that was because I hear the women I worked with say (other swear words). I even heard them use...(a very derogatory term for female genitalia)...when talking about other women they did not like. I still would never use that word in mixed company, I don't know why, I think because it lowers women from the corps of what makes them different. Kind of like when we call a

guy a...(derogatory term for male genitalia)....But anyway, I ended up acting normal, until Tailhook that is. Since Tailhook, I do not even want to joke around with women anymore. I do treat them differently. I think I started to trust them again, since that Midshipman incident, but now it is just too risky. Today if I see a female I know in the O'club or in a restaurant I may say hi, but then we all steer shy. Their friendship is not worth the possibility of losing my job.

Later in the interview he tied this social aversion to military women into the work environment when he said:

I think I would not have minded women on ships before Tailhook. It probably would have made us more aware of their capabilities. Now, I think the men will be afraid to get close knit with the women, and they will feel left out. That will probably lead to hostility and division which will further divide the wardroom. Tailhook has to be handled so that we can see if a witch hunt is going on or not, before I make up my mind about women on ships though. If we can truly do it equally and leave the rule that you are innocent until proven guilty intact then yes, no problem send them anywhere. Let me take their shore duty billet.

In circumstances of uncertainty or risk, people feel more comfortable when those they must rely on are most like themselves. This is because most individuals inherently feel confident that they can be successful. This is particularly true of males as they are more prone to believe that they are responsible for successes and place blame for failures on external factors (Heilman, M. E., 1979). Thus, as shown in Rosabeth Moss Kanter's Book Men and Women of the Corporation, males have a tendency to *homosexually reproduce*, they build their organization or group in their own image. Because women are different physically, and do not usually act the same as

a male, men would rather interact, on a non-sexual basis, with other men, instead of women.

In a study by V. K. Oppenheimer, when the gender mix in a civilian work group became about equal, the group split into two along sexual lines (Oppenheimer, 1975, pp. 318-320). The results of the military men interviewed in this study show the same basic desires to be surrounded by other males. This was especially true when their career had limited experience with female military members. As one Navy Surface Warfare Officer, who had no operational experience with women, (B021) said with respect to the possibility of having women assigned to a combat unit with him:

...the average woman, and we are talking about average here, the average woman is physically weaker than the average man, but more importantly, I think the average woman lacks the killer instinct and discipline that it takes to be part of the team.

In another interview a Naval Officer in the submarine community (B046) stated:

I avoid having to work with women here (Naval Postgraduate School). It is not worth the effort to work with them and risk their misinterpret something I say. It's too easy to be brought up on sexual harassment charges. I will just work with guys, it's easier and safer.

These feelings were apparent in many other interviews and have surfaced in many informal conversations with mid-grade Navy and Marine Corps officers as well. Men would rather work with other men, especially in a combat scenario.



Even if the male believes women can do an effective job they still would rather be in all male units during combat operations. A Marine Major's interview (B030) illustrates this conviction:

Women definitely belong in the military, and I have never seen a substantiated study that even hints otherwise....I am grateful for one thing, and that is that when I went to war, there were no women in my unit....If you look at having women being exactly the same as having men, then you are wrong and it will fail, if you look at women as being another resource you have to manage, a different resource with different considerations, then it will work.

A Lieutenant Commander Naval Aviator (E034) feels women should be fully integrated into all mission areas, including combat. He does have problems with interaction though, as he points out here:

After the Tailhook thing and the skits at San Diego, you look at who is around and watch what you say more often now. Not that we talked bad about women in the RAG (Replacement Air Group) before. We just didn't think about it. Now you think about it and worry about how someone else will perceive it. If they don't like it, they are going to nail you just to make a point. Then the press will escalate everything.

While discussing the interaction with women at The Basic School, this Marine Captain (B012) described why the men did not interact much with the women. He said:

It was kind of like the big joke.... The women did not come to any of the offensive combat training we had. A lot of the time they did not even carry magazines in their mag belts. They put food in there. That was the second big joke, If you wanted to know where the food was, you looked to see where the women Marines were. They were



always eating, and had too few bullets. There is even a picture in our cruise book of female Marines slamming the chow in their mouth. So it brought out very negative connotations and bad feelings toward the women Marines who would eventually be our counterparts.

He personally looked beyond these "jokes," as a college friend was a woman at the school. It was not easy though, as the other men in his class applied peer pressure to dissuade him from interacting with her. He recalled:

...the first female Marine to graduate from Texas A&M was also in that class. She was a personal friend of mine. A very fine Marine Officer, even today, and wants to make a career out of it. She is in the automated data processing field. She is real smart and intelligent. She probably meets the male standard in Physical Fitness better than half the male marines. Because she was my friend, my self and another Marine hung out together a lot. She was married and her husband was a military spouse out at Pendleton, and we would go to the Smithsonian and stuff together. I remember my fellow Marines who did not hang out with them (women), openly anyways, would say that I had to be careful or I would get charged with fraternization. They were terrified of this and literally thought it would end their career before it even got started. Just to be in public with a female Marine. Comments like "you are just a WAGGIE lover" came from some of my fellow AGGIE grads. I would tell them "Hey this person went to school with us, she is our friend, and you are not going to associate with her just because it is not socially acceptable, that is wrong." I still think she is a good officer and I highly respect her.

Another Navy pilot (E038) feels that social interactions between men and women is where the problems start. These problems will then migrate back to the work place. He said:

Talking to this one woman NFO, she would say that she often went out on liberty by herself while the guys went out and did something else. I can relate to that. Because when a P-3 goes somewhere and lands, we go out on liberty together. It would be difficult to imagine a woman coming along to some of the places guys go on liberty. By the same token, I would have no problem flying with women on my crew. It is just that the vast majority of your problems are going to come from immature enlisted personnel. What you do after you are done flying is where the problems will start. It's a social problem.

Whether a particular man in question truly believes women to be equal and feels they have a place in the military or if he has not had the interaction to decide, there is still the desire to keep the unit all male for simplicity. Men find working with other men easier than working with females.

#### **F. THEME V: WOMEN DO NOT WANT TO DEPLOY**

##### **1. Theme**

Men have a perception that many of the women currently in the Navy do not want to go to sea and deploy.

##### **2. Justification**

Women have been restricted, by current policies, from serving on combatants. So their only route to sea duty jobs is aboard non-combatant ships. Thus, their opportunity for sea duty is limited compared to males.

Most men also state that the majority of women do not want to go to sea. Men often cite the 1100 community (general unrestricted line) which is composed of approximately 93% females and is primarily responsible for shore management

jobs. Men tend to group all women in this shore duty category. They also assume that since women are not at sea, they do not want to be there. When the combat exclusion is lifted, men feel that most women will try to avoid sea duty and latch on to the shore duty 1100 community for an easier career.

The popular belief is that women do not want to leave their family, especially those with small children, behind for routine six month deployments. If both spouses are in the Navy then there exists a possibility of them being deployed at the same time making family life more difficult. Men see the lifting of the combat exclusion as putting the Navy into difficult situations. They feel that the percentage of women in the Navy will decrease vice increase as expected. This is because men think women will not sacrifice family over sea duty careers and will leave the service. Men also envision the possibility of the Navy giving women special concessions to avoid deployment schedules that conflict with their spouses which is an option other service members will not have. One supply officer (B001) stated:

We will not have an equitable Navy until we put more women out to sea in roles that are now only staffed with males. I don't think we will have as many women in the Navy if we enforce the rules and make them go out to sea as much as men. I do not think there are that many women out there that are willing to give up that much. There are not that many who are willing to put up with 6 years of straight sea duty. I don't think they will want to suffer in the same way that the males do. In the end I think that they will end up understanding a lot more and I think that will

be very good for them. I hope we see that and I hope it doesn't drive a lot of women out of the Navy. I think a lot of women joined the Navy, some of the ones I have talked to say they do not ever even want to touch a ship. And we protect those women who have those attitudes.

Men also view the idea of giving women the option of participating in combat units as totally wrong. This was one of the strongest opinions in the entire study. Members of the Navy are told when and where they will go to sea to serve their country. Giving any group the option of whether to participate in this process will create resentment among those without that option. A Naval Flight Officer (E013) states:

Absolutely I would make women go out to sea. I'd make sure they were trained for the job they were going to do out there. I don't believe in this double standard sort of thing. (When the combat exclusion is lifted) Either you play the game by the rules or you don't play the game.

One only has to look at registration for the Selective Service to see this concept in effect now. Only males are registered for a potential draft. Some of them definitely do not want to serve in the military, but are not given the option. Thus, men also suggested making everyone register for the draft to show equality, if the country is serious about women in combat. One pilot (E010) stated:

Most females in the military don't want to go into combat. I say that fairly confidently. Most females in the country don't want to serve in the military. So if you take out exclusionary clauses for women, you are talking draft. If we go to war and start a draft, then you have to draft from all the women too. So now we are going to



draft women? Wait a minute, the public won't take that. You have to encompass the whole issue.

So, the Navy has a big challenge ahead on how to address new expanded opportunities for women once the combat exclusion is lifted. Career paths for women will be redefined. The degree of importance placed on sea duty will have a major impact on the participation and composition of women in the operational Navy.

## **G. THEME VI: REVERENCE OF THE FEMALE BODY**

### **1. Theme**

The importance of the body and society's fear of harm to the female body will be detrimental to forces in combat.

### **2. Justification**

Combat military jobs place a high degree of importance on the human body. Physical capabilities can be vital in an environment where overtaking and destroying the enemy are the primary objectives. The major concerns of integrating women into combat are; that they meet the same physical standards so that combat capabilities remain at current levels, and the overriding fear of bodily harm or death to the women.

Men feel that the physical standards for combat need to be maintained at a high level for mission accomplishment. If these standards are lowered for any reason there would be mission degradation and an increase in the loss of life in the unit. Combat conditions and requirements are the same



regardless of the male to female composition of the unit. The need to maintain one standard for combat jobs was emphasized by most officers including the following comments:

I would say no special rules for anyone. Like physical standards and PT (physical training). Either you reach a point where you are passable or you don't. You don't have different passable points for men and women. (E010)

If you can meet that standard fine. There shouldn't be a standard saying this is what the men have to do for special forces and this is what the women have to do. Because when a guy gets shot, you want an equal team member left behind to complete the mission. (E022)

My big problem is double standards. If all standards are constant and a person can meet the standards, then fine. (E029)

If people make the standard they should be a SEAL. Don't have two standards. The same with aviation. Don't let the women get more flight downs than the men. Have it the same. Don't have one number for little boy pilots and another number for little girl pilots. Or any minority for that matter. (E011)

The standards can be evenly applied and should be evenly applied no matter where they're at. (E004)

While men stress the importance of having the same physical standards, they also have major concerns with the chance of women being captured or actually killed in combat. Men feel that the movement for women in combat will be shocked when society views women being killed in the next conflict, or being tortured and used for propaganda as prisoners of war (POW's). Traditional societal views of protecting the women

and children will have to be set aside if women are to be treated as equals in combat. The idea of putting a female, who is capable of giving life and nurturing it, into combat worries many individuals. As one engineering duty officer (E037) stated:

I couldn't see the American public handling a woman, who has the ability to give life, being beaten or mutilated as a POW. Just seeing pictures of someone's mom being half beaten to death. I don't think the country is ready for that.

Some men also feel that chivalry will affect how they react to combat situations involving women. The fear is that men in general will try to protect women from harm and try to prove their own bravery more than they would around another male member of the unit. One aviation maintenance officer (E003) said:

I think there is still a basic protective element there that is programmed into us to some degree to help women. You know, to take care of them or whatever."

Thus, taking more unnecessary risks because women who are around will possibly jeopardize the entire unit's chance of survival or mission accomplishment. Men also worry about if they will be able to treat females taken POW equally and not try to protect them more. One supply officer (E008) said:

I would hate if women got captured and became POW's. Not that men don't get tortured too, but it's almost inevitable what would happen to women.

Thus, males must overcome the fear of bodily harm to females to have the women integrated effectively into combat assignments.

#### **H. THEME VII: MEN HAVE FEW INTERACTIONS WITH WOMEN**

##### **1. Theme**

A majority of men in the Navy and Marine Corps have few interactions with women as peers. The Navy remains basically gender segregated.

##### **2. Justification**

The Navy is predominantly a male organization. Women compose slightly less than 11% of the total force structure (Navy Times, 10 May, 1993). This percentage does not accurately reflect the amount of routine interaction males have with females in the work place. Of the men interviewed, 39.5% had no significant operational interaction with women during their careers. For the group as a whole, the average percentage of assignments that offered the opportunity to work with women was 21.84%. In these billets the approximate percentage of workers (service members or government civilians) that were female was less than 15%. In other words, from the total sample of interviewees, the mean probability of assignment to a billet in which one might work with females,  $P(B)$ , is .2184. The mean probability of the interviewee working with a female given that he is assigned to one of those billets,  $P(F|B)$ , is .145. By applying the

general multiplication rule of probability, the probability of a male in this sample being assigned to a gender mixed command and working with a female,  $P(B\&F)$ , is:

$$\begin{aligned} P(B) &= .2184 & P(F|B) &= .145 \\ P(B\&F) &= P(B) * P(F|B) &= .2184 * .145 \\ &= .031668 = 3.17\% \end{aligned}$$

This study indicates that the probability that a male from the sample population will be placed in a job and work with females is about 3.2%. This figure takes into consideration the medical and restricted line communities within the Navy, which have a higher percentage of women integrated in the work force. If males in these communities are removed from the sample, to leave only Unrestricted Line Officers, the probability drops to 1.3% based on the interviews.

The lower percentage, or 1.3%, is in line with the fact that women have been limited access to these communities. Navy wide, women make up only 1.8% of the Surface Warfare Officers, 2% of the Naval Aviators/Naval Flight Officers and 0% of Submarine Officers. Virtually none of the Submariners interviewed had significant professional relationships with females besides those they encountered on submarine tenders. A pilot with little operational interaction with women (E013) told how this effected his ability to interact with women:

...I can't really develop an impression because I really don't come in contact with, I think it's mainly by choice that I don't come in contact with a lot of women. I guess I feel that we can't really share the same topics of discussion that I would with people I've either gone on cruises with or have gone to school with. There are some

women that I do see from time to time that went to USNA with me that I knew. I can have a discussion with them. Just reverting back to USNA like did you see so and so. Because I never really came into contact with many women during my operational time, I don't know enough of them to strike up a conversation or I don't know enough about them or what they do to strike up a conversation.

A Naval Aviator (E013) expounded on the issue that he had little interaction with women. He recalled the fact that even though there were some women in Replacement Air Group (RAG), they were not pilots "in the RAG." Because of this he had little professional interaction with them. He said:

There are women that work at the RAG, but there are none in the RAG. I haven't come into too much contact with women in the squadrons while I've been in a flying status.

When asked if he had seen males and females work well together at The Basic School, this Marine Captain (B012) had this response:

No, because it really was not given the opportunity to happen. Although we had a female platoon they were not really integrated. We did offensive tactics and they did not get to participate. We did go to the rifle range together, but there was no opportunity to interface.

After a tour aboard an aircraft carrier, in the security detachment, where there was no professional interaction with women this Marine went to the advanced engineering school at Fort Belvoir, VA. He saw this experience as:

...a good learning experience. The Army had a wonderful school. It was my first exposure to females on an active duty basis since TBS. I had seen them when I was at the



division, but I did not really work with them. I happened to be in an all male platoon at the time so I hung out with other males in the platoon. I had very little interaction with them, but in a school environment I did not see any detractors in the learning environment or capabilities or anything like that.

When asked to comment on his exposure to women at the school he thought and concluded this portion of the interview with "I would say I had not enough (interaction) to make any comments on."

External pressures also drive the genders away from each other. An Executive Officer who did not believe women belonged in the military effected this Marine's (B012) interaction with women in the field like this:

...because it became such a polarized issue about the billeting thing, if you were a smart officer you did not really want to talk to any of them (women), if you wanted things to work for you in the future. You did not want to paint yourself into one side of the picture or the other.

Women do comprise 93.5% of the General Unrestricted Line Officers (Gen URL's), but the vast majority of the male Unrestricted Line Officers surveyed stated they had few interactions with Gen URL's. In fact most men surveyed did not even know what Gen URL's did. The conception is that, as a Surface Warfare Lieutenant (B021) put it:

...the General Unrestricted Line is going to be crowded with females...So most of them are females and they occupy some jobs that, quite frankly, I wouldn't want...I really wanted to go overseas and there were several jobs that were good that were open to any officer, Surface Warfare, a pilot, or Gen URL, like protocol officer, flag aids or

assistants to admiral, flag officers, over seas in great places like Italy and Spain, etc. Well, guess what, all those jobs are filled by women and you are not going to move a female officer out of one of those jobs to fill a 1110 job...That is one of the reasons I went to Department Head School early (and then back to sea) because I couldn't get a real nice job ashore, because women had those jobs and it is recognized that women who were Gen URL's were going to stay in those jobs.

Perceptions like this, whether right or wrong, keep the force gender segregated and does not allow for integrated professional development. Another Marine who had no experience with women in the military prior to coming to NPS (E015) had this observation:

I think they have been very professional. However, I think this is not a very military organization. So I don't think it is a fair representation of what it might be like. In San Diego they did have women in the regiment as communicators and supply types and so forth. You saw them around, but you really didn't work with them on a day-to-day basis.

From the responses of those interviewed it is apparent that this integrated development helps males look more favorably upon women in the professional environment. As one Lieutenant (B022) who had been on submarines until assigned to the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) stated:

I did not even know what women in the Gen URL community did, or why they did it until I got here to NPS and met a couple of them. I learned a lot about how they feel and why we never see them in the fleet. You can't see them because they are not allowed. I always thought they were unprofessional, lazy, fat and ignorant. I was wrong. All the Gen URL's I have met here are top notch. Most are not too fat either.

Even at the NPS institutionalized segregation by gender exists. There are a total of 139 Navy and Marine Corps women currently attending advanced education at NPS (see Table I). Of those, 129 are assigned to curriculums which fall into one of three categories: 1) Administrative/Logistic, 2) Computer Intensive and 3) Engineering. Women make up 15.27% of the first category, 15.03% of the second and only 4.88% of the third. Another way to view this statistic is while 82.1% of women at NPS are assigned to the first two categories, just 4.88% are assigned to the engineering field of study. This is segregated when compared to the male percentages of 56.8% for the first two combined and 43.2% for engineering. Of note, the interviews conducted revealed more of a bias against women's full integration from students assigned to the engineering curricula than those assigned to other curricula.

As discussed in Theme II, those men with more integrated professional experience were generally for full integration of women throughout most of the Navy and Marine Corps to include many combat specialties. However, most males do not get many opportunities to work closely with women in the Navy. The Navy remains basically gender segregated.

TABLE I

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL NAVY AND MARINE CORPS STUDENTS SORTED BY "HARD"/"SOFT" CURRICULA AS OF 30 MAY 1993				
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL CURRICULUM	STUDENT TOTAL	NO. OF FEMALE	PERCENT FEMALE	TYPE OF DEGREE
"HARD" SCIENCES				
COMBAT SYS SCI & TECH	33	5	15.15%	MS PHYSICS
NUCLEAR PHYSICS	6	0	0.00%	MS ENG
AERO ENGINEERING	80	0	0.00%	MS ENG (AERO)
COMMUNICATION ENG	19	1	5.26%	MS ENG (ELEC)
ELECTRONIC ENGINEERING	83	3	3.61%	MS ENG (ELEC)
NAVAL ENGINEERING	101	5	4.95%	MS ENG (MECH)
ELEX WARFARE ENGINEERING	17	0	0.00%	MS ENG (SYSTEMS)
ENGINEERING SCIENCE	19	3	15.79%	MS ENG (VARIOUS)
WEAPON SYS ENGINEERING	21	1	4.76%	MS ENG (VARIOUS)
OPERATNL OCEANOGRAPHY	19	1	5.26%	MS METER/OCEAN
AIR-OCEAN SCIENCE	41	2	4.88%	MS METER/OCEAN
ANTI SUBMARINE WARFARE	29	2	6.90%	MS APPLIED SCI
WEAPONS SYS SCIENCE	8	0	0.00%	MS APPLIED SCI
UNDERWATER ACOUSTICS	4	0	0.00%	MS HYDROGR
ADVANCED SCIENCE	12	1	8.33%	MS MATH
SUB TOTAL	492	24	4.88%	
"SOFT" SCIENCES				
STRATEGIC PLANNING	32	6	18.75%	MA NAT'L SEC
NAT'L SECURITY AFFAIRS	36	12	33.33%	MA NAT'L SEC
SPL OPS/LOW INT CONFL	7	0	0.00%	MA NAT'L SEC
INTELLIGENCE	22	3	13.64%	MA NAT'L SEC
SYSTEM INV MGMT	5	0	0.00%	MS MANAGEMENT



TABLE I (continued)

SYS ACQUISITION MGMT	2	0	0.00%	MS MANAGEMENT
ADMIN SCIENCE	7	0	0.00%	MS MANAGEMENT
TRANSPORTATION MGMT	14	4	28.57%	MS MANAGEMENT
ACQSN CONTRACT MGMT	46	1	2.17%	MS MANAGEMENT
MANPOWER/PERSONNEL	34	7	20.59%	MS MANAGEMENT
MATERIAL LOGISTIC MGMT	34	7	20.59%	MS MANAGEMENT
FINANCIAL MGMT	62	10	16.13%	MS MANAGEMENT
OPERATIONAL LOGISTICS	22	3	13.64%	MS OPS RESEARCH
OPERATIONS ANALYSIS	83	9	10.84%	MS OPS RESEARCH
SUB TOTAL	406	62	15.27%	
HIGH TECHNOLOGY				
COMPUTER SCI	57	5	8.77%	MS COMPUTER SCI
INFO TECH MGMT	151	27	17.88%	MS MANAGEMENT IT
SPACE SYS OPERATINS	43	4	9.30%	MS SYS TECH
COMMAND CNTRL COMUNCATN	35	7	20.00%	MS SYS TECH
SUB TOTAL (TECH)	286	43	15.03%	
NOT YET CLASSIFIED				
SPACE SYS ENGINEERING	65	10	15.38%	VARIOUS
PHDs				
OCEANOGRAPHY	2	0	0.00%	PHD OCEANOGRAPHY
OVERALL TOTAL	1239	138	11.14%	



## **I. THEME VIII: GENERATING RESPECT**

### **1. Theme**

Respect is generated from doing things that are uncomfortable or risky in the line of duty. In the Navy and Marine Corps this equates to deployable forces.

### **2. Justification**

The great tradition of the Navy equates to ships at sea. It is tough work and unlike most jobs, requires lengthy family separation. Currently the goal is for deployments to last no longer than six months. This is to help avoid the hardships that were caused by deployments that would sometimes last around one year in length. So regardless of the community, the people that perform the job at sea get more respect than the people that perform the similar job ashore. They have to work longer, do more, and live longer with their mistakes because they are so isolated from the relief of the continental United States.

These sea duty jobs usually have aspects that make them riskier. Performing the desk type aspects of a job is viewed as something that everyone does and should perform well. However, men feel true respect is not received until they do the uncomfortable jobs at sea, tough missions, or perform an exciting event like saving someone's life. One pilot (E024) stated:

We had a tail rotor failure and landed it. I knew that I had three people in the back. I also had a pregnant wife at the time. I was worried about getting ourselves down. The three guys in the back were powerless to do anything. At least we had the controls in our hands to try and do something. That was definitely an eye opening experience. There are some other missions that I've had where search and rescue missions have come up. There was one where my 'helicopter pulled about 30 people out of the water when a submarine caught on fire and was abandoned. Three sailors died and I think our squadron rescued 70. I just remember looking back and seeing a lot of thankful faces. So that was quite a rush. I was proud to be doing what I was doing. I felt like all the hard work was worth it.

Another pilot (E034) states:

The Somalia thing was interesting. After the Marines took a town, we would be the first ones to fly in from the ship. It was your own make-shift airfield in the middle of Africa. We were wearing flak jackets, and had the machine guns ready to go. It was kind of neat. After a few days of not being shot at, then it got old."

Another pilot (E009) describes an Indian Ocean training mission:

We were practicing CSAR (combat search and rescue) on Diego Garcia in the middle of nowhere. It was exciting. As close to an actual combat flight as you can get. Just going fast and low over the water, and fast and low over the beach. It seems faster the lower you get. Yankin' and bankin' up over the trees and into a clearing. Also just flying over land after being at sea for all that time.

This respect can be seen in almost all Navy units. Those members who have already been on a deployment with a ship or squadron, have the experience and respect of others. Those that have not been to sea want to get out there to prove

themselves at what they have been trained to do which is performing at sea.

Since women are currently limited to their degree of participation in the tough and risky jobs at sea. It reinforces the higher degree of masculinity associated with these jobs. Men feel that if women want to be treated equally, then they need to participate in every hard, difficult, life threatening, and family separation aspect of the sea-going Navy. Several officers had comments on this issue:

I think you have to give women the opportunity. If they don't want it then they shouldn't get promoted just like the men that don't go to sea. If they want to take their chances to homestead and not go to sea or whatever, then fine. But they have to take the consequences. Those avenues are available and you have to go to sea to be competitive. The definition of the Navy is a big gray ship. (E023)

If women are going to be in the Navy, then they should have to do the same jobs that a man has to do. (E005)

I think women should be allowed to do, should be forced to do everything that the men do. If the women are out there with us pulling their share of the load at sea, in deploying squadrons and stuff like that, then a lot of the bias will disappear. (E004)

If not, they will always be viewed as subordinates. If women get special considerations, it will only strengthen the degree of masculinity associated with these jobs. Women will be seen

as not being able to participate on an equal basis and will be viewed more as tokens.

## **J. THEME IX: PEAK EXPERIENCES FOR MEN**

### **1. Theme**

Earning the status of being in control of modern technology or performing well in dangerous situations are often peak experiences creating the most excitement. Operating high technology weaponry is redefining combat which has resulted in the creation of a new masculinity.

### **2. Justification**

Combat jobs have been the backbone of the military. Their roles have been documented and glamorized through the years in films. The hand-to-hand combat in wars and close in fighting of infantrymen defined the masculinity of these exciting and daring warriors.

Modern technology has helped create a new masculinity among today's warriors. The new weapons systems have shifted the emphasis from rugged hand-to-hand type combat to a high technology, highly trained warriors in control of multi-million dollar equipment. This is quite surprising, but so was the idea of these futuristic battlefield weapons being controlled by soldiers, sailors, and pilots.

The performance capabilities of these modern weapons systems creates a sense of excitement for their operators. Today's warriors can do more than was ever thought of by prior



generations. Their lives are in jeopardy more often, and they are able to perform more complex missions and life saving rescues due to technology. This only adds to the excitement of their jobs. Since there are few comparable civilian jobs, the military members often say that they can not possibly describe the feeling of excitement and urgency to others who have not experienced it. A pilot (FBJD) stated:

Flying combat in the Gulf was an incredible adrenalin high. It cheapens the experience to talk about it. I was totally in tune with my surroundings. I was finally getting to put into action what I was trained to do. It was synergy. It was noisy, chaotic, you have to be on top of everything. You have to know all the combat systems, warfare systems, electrical systems. We flew at 10 feet because of all the oil smoke. So we going over 110 miles an hour at 10 feet above the ground.

Another pilot (E009) explains:

Flying on shore was mostly training hops (flights), and very seldom did you have a mission except to train and practice. Out at sea, you trained but there were exercises that were very realistic. Kind of a good sense of urgency. There wasn't anything lackadaisical about it. You launched on time, you came back on time, everything was like clock work. Everything was very professional and it was necessarily professional. Where on shore you still had your professionalism, but it wasn't that sense of urgency. The professionalism is expected. There is so much to do on an aircraft carrier. There are so many aircraft to get off. So many aircraft to land. Sixty seconds between landings. Everything goes like clock work or you leave aircraft stranded in the air, if you can't get on deck. It's a serious life and death situation. If you don't watch where you are going on the flight deck, then you end up being blown overboard. If you don't watch what you are doing on the flight deck, then you take some guys head off with your tail rotor. So it's a dangerous place. You always had a sense of urgency. That the things you were doing were for a reason. Flying was very exciting."



The new masculinity is being in control of the most modern, complex, high technology, and expensive weapons systems. Something so advanced that a real world video game is considered the best analogy. It is the once unimaginable concept being operated by someone in their early 20's. They are in charge and have more responsibility than they would for years in corporate America. A pilot (E009) relates this explaining an anti-submarine warfare (ASW) mission:

The helicopter we relieved thought they heard something that was worth checking out. So we went after it. The fixed wing aircraft that were out there with us told us that the noise was surface ship related and not a submarine. Our crewmen were confident that it was a submarine, so we investigated it. We became more and more convinced that it was a submarine. What kind of made it exciting during the whole thing was that the aircraft carrier ASW module didn't think it was a submarine because there weren't any reported in the area. So they kept telling us that it wasn't a submarine. By that time we were 100 percent sure it was a submarine. Then we could actually look down through the water and see the submarine about 100 feet down. It was great. It made you feel pretty cocky. We used our sensors to prove something was there when nobody knew it was there. It kind of proved that the whole thing came together and it worked.

Another pilot (E043) explains:

When the CO (commanding officer) let me fly the plane as the most junior plane commander. I got to fly to France and do a mining exercise. It was a neat feeling of responsibility. Test Pilot School was also a blast. I was in charge of 12 programs of 5-10 million dollars. I tested them (the aircraft) and made the call. My decision was the one they went with. A lot of responsibility.

It becomes apparent how technology has helped define a new masculinity stereotype for today's warrior. These are

the exciting and eventful jobs to have and perform. The real time satellite news coverage of today's conflicts helps reinforce this powerful ideal with the public. Since women have been prohibited from participating in most of these jobs, they are excluded from its glory.

## **K. THEME X: DOUBLE STANDARDS ARE BAD**

### **1. Theme**

Maintenance of double standards in the military reinforces the concept that women are not equal to men and is a prime cause of resentment and discrimination in the service.

### **2. Justification**

Men detest the double standards that are in place to promote the viability of a military career for women. From variations noticed during induction training (whether it be at Annapolis, Officer's Candidate School or a Reserve Officer Training Program) to the semi-annual Physical Fitness Test, men do not like two sets of standards in the service. Of all the themes noticed during the interviews and while analyzing the data, this one was most often mentioned and talked about with the most zeal. The memories of initial military training form many basic ideologies in the minds of midshipmen, cadets and candidates. The fact that women are treated differently, and the standards for women are usually less than for men, ingrains in them the perception that women are less capable in

any endeavor then men. This perception is very hard to remove as it is supported by most societal stereotypes of women.

A Marine Corps Captain (B036) recounted this story while justifying his reasoning as to why women should not be allowed in combat:

...(women at The Basic School) They did not perform very well. Academically they did fine. Physically there was no comparison and there was obviously preferential treatment for them. A perfect example was when the Washington Post came out and wanted to do a story about the women marines that were there when we were there... they showed the women marines going out to PT with us. Sure enough, they took pictures of all us as we ran off and as soon as we made the turn to go run through the mud for another six miles, the women turned around and came back...That caused a lot of hostilities and, right there, turned a lot of men off when it comes to women in the Marine Corps. We were torqued...They are being touted as being equal (and they are not) and we knew it better than anyone. We lived it. When you go out to the field, the women take no offensive positions...the male marines notice that. That is the biggest problem with women marines, the double standards.

Another Marine (B012) had a similar memory of TBS. The fact that women were not required to run as fast as the males caused this problem:

A company of 4 platoons would start out and three would take off (at a faster speed), the three male platoons. Usually we would see them on our way back heading for the turn around point. I remember another incident where the female instructor in charge of the platoon, well one time we were going on a run and one of the male marines started singing some jodies (cadences) that were not derogatory, they were just a motivational thing to say hey come on we are in this together, to the women. To this day I remember them as not being at all derogatory. Well the instructor, she later came back and told our commander that she thought that had hurt the morale of her platoon. The female platoon. Our intentions were good and it

really left a bad taste in a lot of the Marine's mouths. We can't even try to help you be a part of us with out y'all taking offense to it. It left a real sour taste in the men's mouths.

A Naval Flight Officer, or NFO, (B029) had a similar experience with a mud pit and running with rifles at AOCS, he said:

...the two females at OCS for example, when we were running with rifles, they were not running with rifles. They were just running along with us, jogging. The whole idea was to run with a rifle because it was heavy and it hurt. They were not forced to do that. They could have even found a lightened rifle or something massed proportional to them, but they didn't. We also had something called the mud pit. After an inspection which you were guaranteed to fail, you would get into this mud pit, it was just a slime pit, next to a parking lot, you had to do push ups with your face in the mud. Females did not have to participate in that because one or two complain of infections, you know, female type infections. They just stood there and watched us. At the time we were too busy to really care. At graduation I know the women said they would have rather been in the pit with us, at the time I am sure they were pretty happy they were not included. They thought it would have been better if they had gone in, I think they would have been accepted better by the males if they had not requested to be excused from that. You can not expect to maintain complete unit cohesion if certain groups of individuals are treated differently than others in the unit. I think that can be extended to the fleet in general. AOCS had a double standard then, I hope they don't now, but I bet they still do.

This NFO was also disturbed by the double standards which were common at flight school to keep the percentage of women passing the school as high as that for males. He stated:

When I was in flight school, there was also a double standard. A female with any kind of good grades at all would get jets or they would get VAQ squadrons in Key West



or Oxnard. Those were pretty choice billets that people would like to get. For men those were shore tours for the women they were disassociated sea tours, but not any more. There was a, everybody has seen examples of it, there was a general rule that for males, 3 downs and you were out, whether you failed a test or a flight, 3 downs was all you got. On a regular basis females would be given 4 or 5 downs, just to make sure they filled their quota. The flight instructors told us that. It was widely known that we had to retain about the same percentage of women as men that graduated.

Whether this practice was justified as an equal opportunity measure or not, it still leaves bad feelings in the minds of the males who witness it. Another in the aviation community, a Navy pilot (E012) recounted:

We had one marginal female pilot who basically got shoved through the training command. She had problems all through the training command, but for some reason she got pushed along. She got to the squadron and had a lot of problems making 2P. Our progression is 3P (third pilot), 2P (second pilot), and aircraft commander. Then mission commander is on top of everything. That's learning the front and back of the aircraft and it can be a pilot or NFO. We spent twice as much flight time trying to get her to be a 2P because all the check pilots would give her a flight down. The finally gave her some flights with the NATOPS officer to find out what was wrong. Finally she made 2P. Then when she came up for aircraft commander, she had the same problems again. She flew the extra flight again and eventually got designated aircraft commander. One day we were working on the flight schedule in operations and it is always tough finding enough crews. With all the dets out and people in simulators, schools, or sick, we are lucky to man nine crews. So aircraft commanders are tough to find. So I made the crew list and had her as an aircraft commander. I took it to the CO and he said sorry I'm not going to sign this. He signed her aircraft commander paperwork. If he thought that she couldn't do all the flights, then why did he sign the paperwork. He wanted to stack the deck so to speak. He wanted to make sure there was a real strong 2P and 3P in the aircraft with her. He didn't like my choices as 2P and 3P for the flight. That is so bogus. Just tell her right out that she isn't good enough. The women resented



the ones getting the extra help three times as much as the men did. It's like giving all the females a black eye.

With few exceptions, the men stated a desire to set a standard that is meaningful for a particular category of assignment. There should be no waivers for this standard. Any service member, regardless of gender, race or religion should be eligible if that standard can be attained. If a person needs to run 20 miles in a certain time to effectively carry out the tasks assigned that community, then so be it. If a woman can meet the standard there should be no reason she can not join the community.

A pilot (E014) who had friendly interactions with women at flight school noted:

...a female friend of ours who tried to quit several times. She had lots of flight downs and they kept trying to work with her and give her extra time. She was very candid about it. I can tell you if I did that, they would have said sayonara. If I had that many downs and did that, they would have said you're right, you don't belong here.

A Supply Corps Officer from the Naval Academy (E041) mentioned some early exposure to double standards. He describes the way they effected him as:

I'll say straight off that my dad and his classmates (USNA 1961) were against women at USNA. So there were some pre-determined bias there. I had both positive and negative examples of women there. The problem is that I thought there was a dual standard in some areas. The physical fitness standards. Some were so bad you wondered why they were still here. There was a woman who lied about completing the Marine Corps marathon. She was put up for

an honor offense. Pretty cut and dry and most people would be kicked out, but she wasn't. She had other problems before. Another one of the negative things was the black female that wouldn't jump off the tower and I'm sure you've heard that story. They gave her every opportunity and everyone before her had been kicked out for not doing it. The problem I had when she got booted was that she brought in the women's rights groups and the NAACP. She was put back in and graduated. That ticked off everyone I've ever talked to. Why have standards? There's a reason for it, it is because you may have to jump off of a ship some day. When I jumped off it, I blew out an ear drum and had to get surgery because of it. Other than that the women did fine. Personally they did fine academically. Physically several of them had problems.

A Marine Captain (B012) put it like this:

If you take the average male in the military, he can probably run 3 miles in 18 minutes. Let's say the average woman can run it in 20 minutes. So is it a double standard to run the 3 miles in 20 minutes? I don't know. However, if you make the females run the 3 miles in less than 18 minutes you are only going to get a select, small number of females passing. Is that fair? I don't know. It may not be fair to the average woman, but it is fair to the average soldier who needs to rely on his or her squad to run 3 miles in 18 minutes.

The double standard that exists in billet rotation was expressed by a Navy pilot (E011) when he said:

I know that one came here (NPS) from an ROTC instructor job. That frustrates me that I came here from two years of sea duty. She came here from three years of shore duty. When I leave here I'm going to three years of sea duty....my career is to go to sea. Maybe her career is not to go to sea....I know that in a lot of the enlisted rates it is a big factor. The sea shore rotation for men and women is different. The men will do 4 years sea, then 2 shore. For the women it will be 3 sea, 3 shore.... (Because of this) It (my opinion about women in the Navy) is generally a negative opinion. Although there are some professional women who do good jobs. But generally the way women are used in the military drives my opinion. If

they were on the same sea shore rotation then a lot of my bitches wouldn't be valid....If we were billeted with enough people to absorb the losses when a female gets pregnant, then that wouldn't be a valid bitch either. But we aren't.... It's only going to get worse. We are going to have to do more with less in the future. We are going to have to take pregnancies and other problems out of hide.

The single standard issue must work both ways however, and what is considered normal logistic load-out kits (equipment and supplies deemed necessary for combat support) now may need to be re-evaluated and the paradigm shifted. The double standard of only allowing men to accomplish certain tasks should also be removed. Most men surveyed answered that they felt women should be allowed equal access to all communities, but that this should be implemented with a lot of training to try and initiate the women into the force better and give them a chance to compete with entranced males, as well as allow males to continue working at the current level of effectiveness. In other words build the women up before integration so that we do not tear the force down after desegregation. The sooner double standards are removed, the sooner men will accept women as equals. All these areas must be kept in mind when the standards are set for full integration of women in the armed services.

## **V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **A. CONCLUSION**

Women in the Navy have continually proved their ability to perform jobs in times of national crisis. Their contribution in the military is essential for maintaining the All Volunteer Force. The expanded roles for women in the 1990's will put them in careers and combat jobs that have been all male. Thus, the need for clearly defined job roles and requirements will be essential. This study produced five main recommendations derived from the themes of the male officers interviewed. They are:

1. Integrate women fully into all military fields.
2. Have one standard for each job's requirements.
3. Do not give women special treatment as to the option to participate in combat or register for Selective Service.
4. Restructure or eliminate the 1100 community.
5. Require earlier and more extensive training on professional interaction with the opposite sex.

### **B. RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **1. Full Integration**

The process of integrating women into all military activities is essential for men and women to be able to view each other as professional peers. The current system promotes



isolation in work place interaction between the sexes. Men in combat jobs do not serve with women except in limited numbers on shore duty assignments. Some submarine officers have never served in a command with female officers until they attended the Naval Postgraduate School. By integrating women into all jobs, men will see that women are capable of performing just as well as another male officer. Full integration of women in the services will eliminate the institutional bias of the "male only job attitude" that is prevalent in some communities.

## **2. Maintain One Standard for Each Job Type**

While most men interviewed want women integrated into all job areas, they do not want the job requirements or physical standards lowered to accommodate quotas. Men feel this is essential for viewing women as equals. If there are different standards for the same job, those men serving in combat roles feel their lives will be more at risk if they serve with less qualified female personnel. Thus, it is recommended as essential that the Navy develops and clearly identifies one set of overall standard minimum requirements for each job. While most men want high standards for life or death combat jobs, they just want one pass or fail standard. Some men do not care if some job requirements are lowered or eliminated as non-essential to help accommodate females. Just eliminate these job requirements for everyone. If there is



one standard for each particular job, then all personnel in that job will be viewed as an equal team member and not as a token.

### **3. Equality for Selective Service and Combat Options**

The third recommendation is to not give women special treatment as to the option to participate in combat or register for the Selective Service. As the country moves towards putting women in combat, we are showing that they can perform and do belong in the combat arena. If they belong, as do the men, then that is all that matters. The country requires all males to register for the Selective Service in the event of a draft. The "needs of the Navy" are put ahead of individual preference in job selection and assignments when necessary. So a male may be put into a career field or duty station that he did not choose or want to be in originally. If women are allowed to pick and choose, or avoid certain duties because they involve combat situations, then that will undermine the system. Women will not be viewed as equals when they can avoid certain jobs and still get promoted. When women are put in combat, the selection process putting them there should be the same standard for that of all Navy personnel.

### **4. Change General Unrestricted Line Community**

The fourth recommendation involved restructuring or eliminating the 1100 (General Unrestricted Line) community.

Most men view this community as a poorly defined, non-skilled, shore duty community established to keep women officers in the Navy. The move now is towards putting more women at sea on previously all male ships and into combat aviation squadrons. One would expect sea duty to be a big factor in promotions for women as it is for men. The women at sea will also be the one's who will be the most respected. Still having an 1100 community of Unrestricted Line officers composed of 86% females for shore management will be a counter-productive image for a Navy striving for equality. Members of the 1100 community often cite that they take shore duty assignments that all the men do not want. This argument is ironic and almost like saying that men are taking combat jobs that all the women do not want. When women do get into combat roles and eventually in substantial numbers, the division and lack of respect for 1100's will probably increase. Men would like to see this community gradually phased out and the billets filled by personnel going to shore duty assignments. Members of the 1100 community advocate equality without it affecting or eliminating their community. Some officers equate that to people wanting the Defense budget cut, while not having any military bases in their district closed. If this community stays intact, men would at least like it redesignated as a restricted line community since sea duty is not a major emphasis in the jobs.

## 5. Increase Gender Interaction Training

The final recommendation is seen as a way to improve the male/female working relationships for the next generation. Earlier and more extensive training on interacting with the opposite sex in the work place was often cited as a way to make the women in combat issue work better. Men feel that being exposed to women and receiving this training as soon as they enter the Navy, would change perceptions and attitudes about women. If men and women are constantly working side by side as peers during enlisted boot camp, "A" schools, and all officer commissioning programs and training pipelines then the women are more likely to be treated as fellow shipmates. Several men in this study cite the Naval Postgraduate School as their first real extensive contact with women in the Navy. They are usually impressed by the female officers from various community backgrounds. Usually, they will also caveat the statement by saying that NPS is not an operational environment, so they are not sure how the women would do at sea. However, this contact at NPS seems to make men comfortable enough to serve with these women in fleet ships and squadrons. Several men stated if they only had this type of experience years ago instead of at the six to nine year point in their career, their attitudes towards women would have been more receptive earlier. If this type of exposure to quality personnel can happen sooner, and occur continually in

a male's career, most of the problems with integrating women in combat will go away over time.

## APPENDIX A:

### INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR MEN

#### Introductory Statement:

We are doing a study of sexual harassment in the Navy. As you know, most of the attention on this subject has been devoted to what it is like for women in the Navy, how they have been victimized and harassed and discriminated against. What rarely gets looked at is what it is like for men in the Navy, and particularly, what it is like to be part of the Navy when the culture is so radically changing. In particular, we want to know what it is like for men to have women integrated into the armed forces, what it is like to consider lifting the gay ban, what your beliefs about women and gays are. No one pays much attention to that. Few people appreciate what life is like for men in the Navy, so that is what we are looking for in this study. Therefore, I am going to ask you some questions about yourself, about what it is like to be a Naval Officer. I want to know what led you to join the military, there is probably something unique about your life experience that made joining the military attractive. So, I will ask some questions about your background, your family life, your parents and siblings, your early days in the Navy and some



questions about your previous billets, including your experience here at the Naval Postgraduate School.

I want to emphasize that this interview is confidential, so please do not mention your name or anyone else's name. We want you to be as comfortable as possible, so you can say whatever is on your mind.

Interview:

First, tell me a little about your background, your family life, what led you to join the military.

probe: family background, relation between mom and dad (did mom play the traditional role?) ideals and values that motivated him to join.

Talk briefly about your career in the Navy from ROTC, OCS, Academy, etc. First, how did you end up in the community you are in and why did you choose it?

Talk through each assignment and position.

Probe: write down each billet and what it was like, what he liked about it in general. Just have him talk in general about what he did, what it was like, what is "hot" for him, or generates energy as he talks about it, e.g., a particular CO he likes, or one he did not like, etc.

Go back over each duty station and ask: Did you have any contact at all with women at this station and what was it like?

Probe: any incidents that typify how he felt about women. Pay attention to general typifications of women, e.g., women as whiners, women as "tough know it alls", etc. and go for specific stories.

Sometimes men say it is uncomfortable to have women around, that they have to be careful, that this interrupts their comfort and camaraderie. How do you feel about this?

Probe: ask for examples of a time when he felt guarded, like in a bar, a party, joking, playing poker, etc.

Some people say that women simply do not belong in a military setting. Have you had any experiences or seen any incidents that support that belief?

Receive answer to above then ask: Some say women do not belong in combat. What is your opinion?

Probe: Look for exceptions. Women are okay in this situation, but not that. Go for the reasoning and rationale behind it.

When in your own career have you felt most successful, most alive?

Probe: Get the story in detail. What is going on? How did he feel? What adjectives, adverbs does he use to describe the situation?

Have you ever experienced a professional peer relationship with a woman in the military?

Probe: How is he describing this woman? How does he talk about her emotions, the way she does work, etc.?

What has your experience been like with women at NPS?

What is your view of gays in the military?

**APPENDIX B:**  
**Z-GRAM 116**  
(Re-typed in entirety)

7 August 1972

FM CNO (Z-116)

TO NAVOP

BT

UNCLAS//N05350//

EQUAL RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN IN THE NAVY

1. THERE HAS BEEN MUCH DISCUSSION AND DEBATE WITH RESPECT TO EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN IN OUR COUNTRY OVER THE PAST FEW YEARS. MY POSITION WITH RESPECT TO WOMEN IN THE NAVY IS THAT THEY HAVE HISTORICALLY PLAYED A SIGNIFICANT ROLE IN THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF OUR NAVAL MISSION. HOWEVER, I BELIEVE WE CAN DO FAR MORE THAN WE HAVE IN THE PAST IN ACCORDING WOMEN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO CONTRIBUTE THEIR EXTENSIVE TALENTS AND TO ACHIEVE FULL PROFESSIONAL STATUS. MORE OVER, THE IMMINENCE OF AN ALL VOLUNTEER FORCE HAS HEIGHTENED THE IMPORTANCE OF WOMEN AS A VITAL PERSONNEL RESOURCE. I FORESEE THAT IN THE NEAR FUTURE WE MAY VERY WELL HAVE AUTHORITY TO UTILIZE OFFICER AND ENLISTED WOMEN ON BOARD SHIPS. IN VIEW OF THIS POSSIBILITY WE MUST BE IN A POSITION TO UTILIZE WOMEN'S TALENTS TO HELP US ACHIEVE THE SIZE NAVY WE NEED UNDER AN ALL VOLUNTEER FORCE ENVIRONMENT AND STILL MAINTAIN THE SEA SHORE ROTATION GOALS FOR ALL NAVAL PERSONNEL TOWARDS WHICH WE HAVE BEEN WORKING. TO THIS END THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY AND I HAVE ESTABLISHED A TASK FORCE TO LOOK AT ALL LAWS, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES THAT MUST BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO ELIMINATE ANY DISADVANTAGES TO WOMEN RESULTING FROM EITHER LEGAL OR ATTITUDINAL RESTRICTIONS.

2. AS ANOTHER STEP TOWARD ENSURING THAT WOMEN IN THE NAVY WILL HAVE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO CONTRIBUTE THEIR TALENTS AND BACKGROUND TO ACCOMPLISHMENT OF OUR MISSIONS, WE ARE TAKING THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS:

A. IN ADDITION TO THE ENLISTED RATINGS THAT HAVE RECENTLY BEEN OPENED, AUTHORIZED LIMITED ENTRY OF ENLISTED WOMEN INTO ALL RATINGS.

B. THE UNLIMITED GOAL, ASSIGNMENT OF WOMEN TO SHIPS AT SEA, WILL BE TIMED TO COINCIDE WITH FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF PENDING LEGISLATION. AS AN IMMEDIATE STEP, A LIMITED NUMBER OF OFFICER AND ENLISTED WOMEN ARE BEING ASSIGNED TO THE SHIP'S COMPANY OF USS SANCTUARY AS A PILOT PROGRAM. THIS PROGRAM WILL PROVIDE VALUABLE PLANNING INFORMATION REGARDING THE PROSPECTIVE INCREASED UTILIZATION OF WOMEN AT SEA.

C. PENDING FORMAL CHANGES TO NAVY REGULATIONS, SUSPEND RESTRICTIONS REGARDING WOMEN SUCCEEDING TO COMMAND ASHORE AND ASSIGN THEM ACCORDINGLY.

BT

(Cited from Holm, 1982, pp. 400 - 401)

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Abbey, A., "Sex Differences in Attributions for Friendly Behavior: Do Males Misperceive Females Friendliness?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol 32, pp. 830-838, 1982.
- Abbey A. and Melby, C., "The Effects of Nonverbal Cues on Gender Differences in Perceptions of Sexual Intent," *Sex Roles*, 15, pp. 283-298, 1986.
- Acker, J., "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations," *Gender & Society*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 139-158, June 1990.
- Choderow, N., *The Reproduction of Mothering*, University of California Press, 1978.
- Gilligan, C., *In a different voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*, Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Glaser, B. and Strauss, A., *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Widenfeld & Nicholson, 1967.
- Hayward, T. B., Memorandum to Secretary of the Navy, Edward Hidalgo, 11 December, 1979.
- Hearings on H. R. 6569 "Registration of Women" before the Military Personnel Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, 96th Congress, 5-6 March, 1980.
- Heilman, M. E. and Kram, K. E., "Self-Derogating Behavior in Women - Fixed or Flexible: The Effects of Co-Worker's Sex," *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, July, 1979.
- Holm, J., *Women in the Military*, Presideo Press, 1982.
- "Johnson Signs Bill for Women Generals and Pins Medals on 2 Nurses," *New York Times*, 9 November, 1967, p. 3.
- Kanter, R. M., *Men and Women of the Corporation*, Basic Books Inc., 1977.



Lang-Takac, E. and Osterweil Z., "Separateness and Connectedness: Differences Between Genders," *Sex Roles* Vol. 27 Nos. 5/6, 1992.

Mathews, W., "Cleared for Takeoff," *Navy Times*, 10 May 1993.

McKenzie, C. J., *Attitudes of Male Unrestricted Line Officers Towards Integration of Women into their Designators and Towards Women in Combat*, Master's Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California, December 1983.

Miles, M. B., "Qualitative Data as an Attractive Nuisance." In J. Van Maanen (Ed.), *Qualitative Methodology*, 1983.

Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A. M., *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Sage Publications, 1984.

Miller, N., *The U. S. Navy, an Illustrated History*, American Heritage Publishing Co., 1977.

Oppenheimer, V. K., "The Sex-Labeling of Jobs," *Women and Achievement*, Mednick, M. T. A., Tangri, S. S., Hoffman, L. W., (ed.), Hempshire Publishing Corp., 1975.

Owens v. Brown, 455 F. Supp. 291 (D.D.C. 1978).

"Pregnancy Ousters Relaxed," *Air Force Times*, 17 March, 1971, p. 3.

Quester, G. H., *The Problem*, edited by Goldman, N.L., *Female Soldiers - Combatants or Noncombatants?*, Greenwood Press, 1982.

Rogan, H., *Mixed Company*, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1981.

Rosenfeld, P., and others, "Navy Research into Race, Ethnicity, and Gender Issues: A Historical Review", *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 15, pp. 407-426, 1991.

Sadler, G. C., Capt, USN, "Women in the Sea Services: 1972-1982," *U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, May, 1983.

Tamplin, J. A., *Women in the Military: A Question of Utilization*, Master's Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California, 1974.

Tannen, D., *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*, Ballentine Books, 1990.



Thomas, P. J., "Women in the Military: America and the British Commonwealth: Historical Similarities," *Armed Forces and Society* Vol. 4, August, 1978.

Thomas, P. J., Telephone conversation between Pat Thomas and the author (Gilbeau), 28 May 1993.

Treadwell, M. B., *U.S. Army in World War II: Special Studies-The Women's Army Corps*, Washington D.C.: Department of the Army, 1954.

United States, Department of Defense, Military Pay and Allowances Entitlements Manual (DOD) 7000.14-R, *DOD Financial Management Regulation Military Pay, Policy, and Procedures*, V.7, Part A, 1993.

United States, Department of the Navy, NAVPERS 15665H, *Uniform Regulations*, 1991.

United States, Department of the Navy, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations: Navy Women's Study Group, *Navy Study on Progress of Women in the Navy*, 1987.

United States, Department of the Navy, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations: Navy Women's Study Group, *An Update Report on the Progress of Women in the Navy*, 1990.

United States, Department of the Navy, Office of the Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Navy Instruction (SECNAVINST) 1300.12.

"A Double Standard in the Navy," *Washington Post*, 25 August, 1970.

"2 Unwed Mothers Fight to Stop Ouster From WAFs," *New York Times*, 3 January, 1971, p. 24.

# INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

	No. Copies
1. Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria VA 22304-6145	2
2. Library, Code 052 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey CA 93943-5002	2
3. Frank J. Barrett, AS/BR Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943	2
4. Gail Fann Thomas, AS/FA Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943	2
5. Patricia Thomas Navy Personnel Research and Development Center San Diego, California 92152	1
6. Lieutenant Robert W. Ernst 5240 S.W. 10 Street Plantation, Florida 33317	3
7. Lieutenant Robert J. Gilbeau 1317 Austin Street Fremont, California 94539	3















DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY  
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL  
MONTEREY CA 93943-5101

GAYLORD S



DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY



3 2768 00018895 7